



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.



### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



*EX LIBRIS*

*WILFRED HAROLD MUNRO*





DO

17

.B2

17







Willed Harold Wilson

Feb 26 1900

# MEMOIRS,

ILLUSTRATING THE

## *HISTORY OF JACOBINISM.*

A TRANSLATION FROM THE FRENCH OF

THE ABBE BARRUIL.

---

PART I.—VOL. I.

*THE ANTICHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY.*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY T. BURTON AND CO. NO. 11, GATE STREET, LINCOLN'S-  
INN FIELDS,

AND SOLD BY E. ROOKER, NO. 56, NEW BOND-STREET.

---

1797.





Open  
Library  
Bloomington  
3-15-1939  
4 v m 2.

# P R E F A C E

OF THE

## TRANSLATOR.

---

READER,

IN the work laid before you, you are not to expect the beauties of imagination; truth alone is the object of this research. History has always been considered as the school in which the statesman is to learn the art of government; the citizen to read with awe of those disastrous days of bloodshed and rapine, expressed by the term *Revolution*. This work will lay open the most terrible, and perhaps the most astonishing concatenation of intrigue, that has ever entered the mind of man, to bring about the dreadful revolution, with which all Europe has been convulsed.

The First Part will contain, THE ANTI-CHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY, or that of the *Sophisters of Impiety* against the God of Christianity, and against every religion and every altar, whether Protestant or Catholic, Lutheran or Calvinist, provided it be but Christian.

The Second Part will show, THE ANTI-MONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY, or that of the *Sophisters of Impiety*, coalescing with those of *Rebellion* against all kings.

The Third Part will demonstrate THE ANTI-SOCIAL CONSPIRACY, or that of the *Sophisters of Impiety* coalescing with those of *Anarchy* against every religion, against every government, without even excepting the republican, against all civil society and all property whatever.

The first of these conspiracies was that of those men called Philosophers. The second that of the Philosophers united with the Occult Lodges of the Freemasons \*. The third was that of the Philosophers and the Occult-Masons coalesced with the Illuminés, who generated the Jacobins.

\* We say OCCULT LODGES, as the Freemasons in general were far from being acquainted with the conspiracies of the Occult Lodges; and indeed many were not people to be tampered with. It might be objected, that all lodges were occult: with regard to the public they were so; but besides the common lodges, there existed others which were hidden from the generality of the Freemasons. It is those which the author styles ARRIERES LOGES, and that we have translated by OCCULT LODGES.

It

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

It is with confidence that we present the first volume to the public, after the approbation which one of the most distinguished authors of the age, both for his political knowledge, and the noble ardor he has shown in his writings to subdue the growing evil, was pleased to express, when he read the first volume of the French original. He was flattering enough to say, in writing to the author, "The whole of the wonderful narrative is supported by documents and proofs, with the most juridical regularity and exactness. The reflexions and reasonings are interspersed with infinite judgment, and in their most proper places, for leading the sentiments of the reader and preventing the force of plausible objections. The tendency of the whole is admirable in every point of view, political, religious and philosophical."

After such a decided opinion on the French original, the translator cannot but think it *a duty he has fulfilled* in laying such a work open to those of his countrymen, who may not be sufficiently  
versed

versed in the French language; and if in so critical a moment, he can, by this means, serve his country, he is willing to take upon himself all those inaccuracies of style, which are too frequent in translations, especially when done in haste. That the reader may be instructed in these dreadful plots, and be acquainted with the whole and nothing but the truth, is the sincere wish of the

TRANSLATOR.

It would be useless to add, that in all quotations the most literal exactness has been observed.

---

CON-

# CONTENTS.

---

	Page
<i>P</i> RELIMINARY DISCOURSE -	ix
CHAP. I. Of the Principal Actors of the Conspiracy	1
CHAP. II. Of the Object, Extent, and Existence of the Antichristian Conspiracy - -	24
CHAP. III. The Secret, the Union and the Epoch of the Conspiracy - -	36
MEANS OF THE CONSPIRATORS.	
CHAP. IV. First Means of the Conspirators	52
CHAP. V. Second Means of the Conspirators. —The Extinction of the Jesuits	72
CHAP. VI. Third Means of the Conspirators. —Extinction of all the Religious Orders - -	99
CHAP. VII. Fourth Means of the Conspirators. —Voltaire's Colony - -	116
CHAP. VIII. Fifth Means of the Conspirators. —The Academic Honors -	123
CHAP. IX. Sixth Means of the Conspirators.—In- undation of Antichristian Writings	132
CHAP. X. Of the Spoliations and Violences projected by the Conspirators, and concealed under the Name of Toleration - -	150
CHAP.	

	Page
CHAP. XI. Part, Mission and private Means of each of the Chiefs of the Antichristian Conspiracy	158
ADEPTS AND PROTECTORS.	
CHAP. XII. Progress of the Conspiracy under Voltaire. First Class of Protectors. Crowned Adepts - - -	190
CHAP. XIII. Of the Adept Princes and Prin- cesses - - -	213
CHAP. XIV. Third Class of protecting Adepts. —Ministers, Noblemen, and Ma- gistrates - - -	232
CHAP. XV. The Class—Of Men of Letters	275
CHAP. XVI. Conduct of the Clergy towards the Anti- christian Conspirators - - -	300
CHAP. XVII. New and deeper Means of the Conspira- tors, to seduce even the lowest Classes of the People - - -	312
CHAP. XVIII. Of the general Progress of the Conspi- racy throughout Europe.—Triumph and Death of the Chiefs - - -	337
CHAP. XIX. Of the great Delusion which rendered the Conspiracy against the Altar so successful	356



## PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE.

---

AT an early period of the French Revolution, there appeared a sect calling itself Jacobin, and teaching *that all men were equal and free!* In the name of their equality and disorganizing liberty, they trampled under foot the altar and the throne; they stimulated all nations to rebellion, and aimed at plunging them ultimately into the horrors of anarchy.

At its first appearance, this sect counted 300,000 adepts; and it was supported by two millions of men, scattered through France, armed with torches and pikes, and all the fire-brands of revolution.

It was under the auspices of this sect, by their intrigues, their influence, and their impulse, that France beheld itself a prey to every crime; that its soil was stained with the blood of its pontiffs and priests, of its rich men and nobles; with the blood of every class of its citizens, without regard to rank, age or sex! These were the men who,

VOL. I.

b

after

after having made the unfortunate Lewis XVI. his Queen and Sister, drink to the very dregs the cup of outrage and ignominy during a long confinement, solemnly murdered them on a scaffold, proudly menacing the sovereigns of the earth with a similar fate ! These are the men who have made the French Revolution a scourge to all Europe, a terror to its Powers, who vainly combine to stop the progress of their revolutionary armies, more numerous and destructive than the inundations of the Vandals.

Whence originated these men, who seem to arise from the bowels of the earth, who start into existence with their plans and their projects, their tenets and their thunders, their means and ferocious resolves ; whence, I say, this devouring sect ? Whence this swarm of adepts, these systems, this frantic rage against the altar and the throne, against every institution, whether civil or religious, so much respected by our ancestors ? Can their primogeniture in the order of the revolution give them this tremendous power, or were they not anterior ? is it not their own work ? where then was their hiding place ? Their schools, their masters, where shall we find them, and who will dive into their future projects ? This French Revolution ended, will they cease to desolate the earth, to murder its kings, to fanaticise its people ?

These

These certainly are questions that cannot be in- <sup>Import-</sup>  
different to nations or their rulers, or to those who <sup>ance of</sup>  
watch for the happiness and preservation of so- <sup>their</sup>  
ciety ; and these are the questions which I will at- <sup>History</sup>  
tempt to answer. I will seek their solution in the  
very annals of the sect, whence I will shew their  
plans and systems, their plots and means. Such,  
Reader, will be the object of the following Me-  
moirs.

Had I seen the plots and oaths of the Jaco-  
bins end with the disasters they produced; had  
I seen the cloud of our misfortunes dissipated  
with the French Revolution, still should I stand  
convinced of the importance and necessity of  
disclosing to the world the dark recesses from  
whence it burst into being.

When with awe and reverence we read of <sup>to po-</sup>  
plagues and other scourges that have desolated the <sup>stency ;</sup>  
earth, though the danger may be passed, they are  
not to be considered as objects of mere curiosity.  
In the history of poisons we find the antidotes; in  
the history of monsters we learn the weapons that  
destroyed them. When former scourges re-appear,  
or are to be apprehended, is it not our duty to  
explore the causes which first promoted their de-  
structive influence, the means by which they might  
have been opposed, and the errors by which they  
may again be produced? The present gene-  
ration is instructed by the misfortunes of the

past; be then the future instructed by the history of ours.

to the  
present  
genera-  
tion.

First error  
on the  
cause of  
the revo-  
lution.

But we have evils yet more pressing to combat: the present generation has been deluded; and such delusions must be done away as may double our misfortunes in the instant when we think ourselves most secure. We have seen men obstinately blind to the causes of the French Revolution: we have seen men who wished to persuade themselves that this conspiring and revolutionary sect had no existence anterior to the revolution. In their minds this long chain of miseries which has befallen France, to the terror of all Europe, was the mere offspring of that concurrence of unforeseen events inseparable from the times; it is in vain, in their conceptions, to seek conspirators or conspiracies, vain to search for the hand that directs the horrid course. The man who rules to-day knows not the plans of his predecessor, and he that shall follow will, in their opinions, be equally ignorant of those of the present ruler.

Prepossessed with such false ideas, and acting under so dangerous a prejudice, these superficial observers would willingly make all nations believe, that the French Revolution could to them be no cause of alarm; that it was a volcano rapidly venting itself on the unfortunate country that gave it existence, whilst its focus and its origin remain unfathomable. Causes unknown (they will say) but peculiar

peculiar to your climate ; elements less subject to ferment ; laws more analogous to your character ; the public fortune better balanced ; these and such as these are reasons sufficient to make you regardless of the fate of France. But should such, alas ! be your impending fate, vain will be your efforts to avert the threatening blow. The concurrence and fatality of circumstances will drag you towards it ; the very ramparts you shall build against it will fall back upon you, and perhaps level the space that now divides you from the horrid scene of anarchy and desolation.

Who could conceive, that such was the language I have heard fall from the mouths even of those whom the unfortunate Lewis XVI. had called near his person to ward off the blows perpetually aimed at him by the revolution ! a language better calculated to lull all nations into that fatal security which portends destruction.—I have now before me the Memorial of an Ex-minister, consulted on the causes of this infernal revolution, and in particular as to the chief conspirators, which he should have better known, and on the plan of the conspiracy.—I hear this man answering, that it would be useless to seek either men, or any set of men, conspiring against the altar and the throne, or to suppose that any plan had been framed. Unfortunate monarch ! Are those who are to watch for the safety of your person, for the safety of your people, ignorant of the  
b 3 names,

names, of the very existence of your enemies ! If then we behold both you and your people falling victims to their plots, can we be astonished ?

Truths  
combat-  
ing the  
first error.

Strong in the facts, and armed with the proofs shown in the following Memoirs, we shall hold a very different language. We shall shew that with which it is incumbent on all nations and their chiefs to be acquainted : we shall demonstrate that, even to the most horrid deeds perpetrated during the French Revolution, every thing was foreseen and resolved on, was combined and premeditated : that they were the offspring of deep-thought villainy, since they had been prepared and were produced by men, who alone held the clue of those plots and conspiracies, lurking in the secret meetings where they had been conceived, and only watching the favorable moment of bursting forth. Though the events of each day may not appear to have been combined, there nevertheless existed a secret agent and a secret cause, giving rise to each event, and turning each circumstance to the long-sought-for end. Though circumstances may often have afforded the pretence or the occasion, yet the grand cause of the revolution, its leading features, its atrocious crimes, will still remain one continued chain of deep-laid and premeditated villainy.

Second  
error on  
the nature

In revealing the object, and showing the extent of these plots, I meet a second error, more dangerous



gerous than the first. There are men who make no difficulty in owning that the French Revolution was premeditated, but that the intention of the first authors was pure, and that they only sought the happiness and regeneration of empires; that if great misfortunes have since happened, they arose from the obstacles thrown in their way; that a great people cannot be regenerated without commotion, but that the tempest will subside, and a calm succeed the swelling billow. Then nations, astonished at the fear they had conceived of the French Revolution, and true only to its principles, will be happy in imitation.

This error is the favorite theme of the Jacobin missionaries; it was this that gained them their first instruments of rebellion; that cohort of constitutionalists, who still look on their decrees of the *RIGHTS OF MAN* as the summit of legislative perfection, and still impatiently wait the fatal day when the world shall impetuously move in the sphere of their political rhapsody. It was this that gained them that prodigious number of votaries more blind than wicked, and who might have been mistaken for honest, if virtue could have combined with ferocity in search of happier days. It was this that gained them those men whose well-meant, though stupid credulity, misled them to believe in the necessity of the carnage of the 10th

of August, and of the horrid butcheries of the 2d of September; in a word, all those men who, in the murders of 3 or 400,000 fellow-creatures, in the extermination of millions of victims by famine, the sword, or the guillotine, seek consolation, in spite of this depopulating scourge, in the empty hope that this dreadful chain of horrors may be productive of happier days.

Truths  
combat-  
ing the  
second-  
ror.

In answer to these fallacious hopes, to these pretended good intentions, I will oppose the real views of this revolutionary sect, their true projects, their conspiracies, and their means of execution. I will show them, for they must be divulged, the proofs being acquired. The French Revolution has been a true child to its parent sect; its crimes have been its filial duty; and those black deeds and atrocious acts, the natural sequel of the principles and systems that gave it birth. I will show more; so far from seeking future prosperity, the French Revolution is but a sportive essay of its strength, while the whole universe is its aim. If elsewhere the same crimes are necessary, they will be committed; if equal ferocity is necessary they will be equally ferocious; and it will extend wheresoever its errors are received.

True con-  
sequences  
of these  
truths.

The reflecting reader must then conclude, that either this Jacobin sect must be crushed or society overthrown: that all governments must give place to those massacres, those convulsive disorders, and that

that infernal anarchy which rages in France : 'tis true there is no other alternative, universal destruction or extinction of the sect. But let it be remembered, that to crush a sect is not to imitate the fury of its apostles, intoxicated with its sanguinary rage and propense to enthusiastic murder. It is not to massacre and immolate its adepts, or retort on them the thunders they had hurled. To crush a sect, is to attack it in its schools, to reveal its imposture, and show to the world the absurdity of its principles, the atrocity of its means, and above all the profound wickedness of its teachers. Yes ; strike the Jacobin, but spare the man ; the sect is a sect of opinion, and its destruction will be doubly complete on the day when it is deserted by its disciples, to return to the true principles of reason and society.

The sect is monstrous, but all its disciples are not monsters. Its care in hiding its latter projects, the extreme precaution with which it initiated the chosen of the elect, shews how much it feared the desertion of the multitude of its disciples, and its consequent destruction, had the horror of its mysteries been surmised. For my part, I never doubted, how depraved soever the Jacobins may have been, that the greatest part would have deserted the sect could they have foreseen whither and by what means they were led. Could the French people have followed such chiefs, had it  
been

been possible to make them conceive to what lengths the plans and plots of the conspirators would carry them !

That  
these plots  
should be  
known,

the in-  
terest of  
all na-  
tions ;

Were France, like hell, a bottomless pit, impene-  
trable to every voice but that of the fiends of the re-  
volution, still it is not too late to acquaint other na-  
tions of their danger. They have heard of the crimes  
and misfortunes of that revolution, let them learn  
the lot that awaits them should Jacobinism prevail ;  
let them learn that they are not less within the  
grand revolutionary circle than France itself ; that  
all those crimes, the anarchy and bloody scenes  
which have followed the dissolution of the French  
empire, equally await all other nations ; let them  
learn that their altars and their thrones, their pon-  
tiffs and their kings, are doomed to the same fate  
with those of France : all are comprehended within  
the grand conspiracy.

interest  
of all go-  
vern-  
ments.

When a phantom of peace shall seem to termi-  
nate the present war between the Jacobins and the  
combined powers, it certainly will be the interest of  
all governments to ascertain how far such a peace can  
be relied on. At that period, more than at any other,  
will it be necessary to study the secret history of  
that sect, which sends its legions rather to shiver  
the sceptre than to fight the power, which has not  
promised to its adepts the crowns of princes,  
kings and emperors, but has required of and bound  
those adepts by the oath of destroying them all :

at

at that period we must remember, that it is not in the field of Mars that the war against sects is the most dangerous ; when rebellion and anarchy are in the very tenets of the sectary, the hand may be disarmed, but war glows warmly in the heart. The sect, weakened, may slumber for a while, but such a sleep is the calm preceding the irruption of the volcano. It no longer sends forth its curling flames ; but the subterraneous fire winds its course, penetrates, and, preparing many vents, suddenly bursts forth and carries misery and devastation wherever its fiery torrent rolls.

The object of these Memoirs is not to treat precisely of that state of war or of peace carried on from Power to Power. Then it often happens that, all resources being exhausted, the sword must be sheathed, though the original grievances still subsist. Let the rulers of the people discuss the means of force. But we know there exists another sort of war, which a confidence in treaties only renders more fatal ; *that* war is a war of plots and conspiracies, and against them public treaties can never avail. Woe to that Power which shall have made peace without knowing why its enemy had declared war against it. What the sect had done before it burst forth the first time, it will do again to prepare a second eruption. In darkness it will conspire anew, and calamities still more disastrous will teach all nations that the French revolution was only

only the first step towards the universal dissolution which the sect has so long been meditating and contriving.

Object of  
these me-  
moirs.

Such were the reasons which stimulated me to investigate the plots and wishes, the tortuous means and nature of this sect. We have witnessed the frantic rage and the ferocity of its legions; we have known them as the agents of the French Revolution, as the perpetrators of all its atrocious crimes and devastations; but few are acquainted with the schools that have formed them. Posterity, alas! will feel, during many generations, their dire effects. To trace their ravages, it will only have to cast its eyes around. The ruins of the palaces and the temples, the fallen cities; the mansions destroyed throughout the provinces, will paint in glowing colours the devastations of the modern Vandals. The lists of proscription, fatal to the prince and so many of his subjects, the deserted villages, all, in a word, will long be the vouchers of those fatal lanterns, of that insatiable guillotine, of those legislative executioners supported by bands of assassins.

Circumstances so painful and so humiliating to human nature will not be recorded in these memoirs. It is not to expose what a Marat or a Robespierre has done, but to bare to the light the schools, the systems, the conspiracies, in a word, the masters who have formed a Philippe D'Orleans, a Syeyes, a Condorcet, or a Petion,  
and



and who at this present time are forming in all nations men who would rival Marat and Robespierre in their cruelties. Our object is, that, the sect of the Jacobins and their conspiracies once known, their crimes shall be no longer a cause of surprise; that their propensity to the effusion of blood, their blasphemies against Christ and his altars, their frantic rage against the throne, and their cruelties against their fellow-citizens, shall be as naturally understood as the ravages of the plague. And may nations in future as cautiously guard against the one, as they preserve themselves against the other!

It was to attain this important object that all our researches on the sect have been directed at its chiefs, its origin, its plots, its plans, and its progress; more particularly investigating the means it employed to bring about the revolution, than describing its conduct during that revolution.

The result of our research, corroborated by proofs drawn from the records of the Jacobins, and of their first masters, has been, that this sect with its conspiracies is in itself no other than the coalition of a triple sect, of a triple conspiracy, in which, long before the revolution, the overthrow of the altar, the ruin of the throne, and the dissolution of all civil society had been debated and resolved on.

1st.

1st. Many years before the French Revolution, men who styled themselves Philosophers conspired against the God of the Gospel, against Christianity, without distinction of worship, whether Protestant or Catholic, Anglican or Presbyterian. The grand object of this conspiracy was to overturn every altar where Christ was adored. It was the conspiracy of the *Sophisters of Impiety*, or the ANTICHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY.

2dly. This school of impiety soon formed the *Sophisters of Rebellion*: these latter, combining their conspiracy against kings with that of the Sophisters of Impiety, coalesce with that ancient sect whose tenets constituted the whole secret of the *Occult Lodges* of Free-masonry, which long since, imposing on the credulity of its most distinguished adepts, only initiated the chosen of the elect into the secret of their unrelenting hatred for Christ and kings.

3dly. From the Sophisters of Impiety and Rebellion, arose the *Sophisters of Impiety and Anarchy*. These latter conspire not only against Christ and his altars, but against every religion natural or revealed: not only against kings, but against every government, against all civil society, even against all property whatsoever.

This third sect, known by the name of *Illuminés*, coalesced with the Sophisters conspiring against Christ, coalesced with the Sophisters who,  
with

with the Occult Mafons, confpired againft both Chrift and kings. It was the coalition of the adepts of *impiety* of the adepts of *rebellion*, and the adepts of *anarchy*, which *formed the CLUB of the JACOBINS*. Under this name, common to the triple feft (originating from the name of the order, whose convent they had feized upon to hold their fittings), we fhall fee the adepts following up their triple confpiracy againft God, the King, and Society. Such was the origin, fuch the progress of that feft, fince become fo dreadfully famous under the name of JACOBIN.

In the prefent Memoirs each of thefe three confpiracies fhall be treated feparately; their authors unmasked, the object, means, coalition and progress of the adepts fhall be laid open.

Proofs of the moft pointed nature are neceffary, when fuch horrid plots are denounced to all nations; and it is to give thefe proofs the greater authenticity, that the title of MEMOIRS has been prefixed to this work. To have written the fimple hiftory of the Jacobins might have fufficed for many; but thefe Memoirs are intended for the hiftorian, who will find a collection of proofs, both numerous and convincing, all extracted from the records and avowals of the confpirators themfelves. Strong in thefe proofs, we fhall not fear to proclaim to all nations, “that whatever their religion or their government may be, to whatever  
“ rank

“rank they may belong in civil society, if Jacobinism triumphs, all will be overthrown; that should the plans and wishes of the Jacobins be accomplished, their religion with its pontiffs, their government with its laws, their magistrates and their property, all would be swept away in the common mass of ruin! Their riches and their fields, their houses and their cottages, their very wives and children would be torn from them. You have looked upon the Jacobinical faction as exhausting itself in France, when it was only making a sportive essay of its strength. Their wishes and their oaths extend throughout Europe; nor are England or Germany, Italy or Spain, strangers to their intrigues.”

Let not the Reader take this for the language of enthusiasm or fanaticism; far be such passions either from myself or my readers. Let them decide on the proofs adduced, with the same coolness and impartiality which has been necessary to collect and digest them. The order followed in the investigation of these conspiracies shall be exactly that in which they were generated. We shall therefore begin with the conspiracy against the whole religion of the Gospel, and which we have styled the **ANTICHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY**.

THE

---

# THE ANTICHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY.

---

## CHAP. I.

### *Of the Principal Actors of the Conspiracy.*

**A**BOUT the middle of this century, there appeared three men leagued in the most inveterate hatred against Christianity. These were Chiefs of the conspiracy. Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Frederick II. King of Prussia. Voltaire hated religion because he was jealous of its Author, and of all those whom it had rendered illustrious; D'Alembert because his cold heart was incapable of affection; Frederick because he had never seen it but through the medium of its enemies.

To these three a fourth must be added, named Diderot; hating religion because he doated on nature; enthusiastically wedded to the chaos of his own ideas, he chose rather to build his system on chimeras and form mysteries of his own, than submit to the light of the Gospel.

B

Numerous

Numerous were the adepts afterwards drawn into this conspiracy, generally stupid admirers or secondary agents. Voltaire the chief, D'Alembert the most subtle agent, Frederick the protector and often the adviser, Diderot the forlorn hope.

Voltaire. The first of these conspirators, Mary Francis Arouet, was born at Paris, February 20th, 1694, son of an ancient notary of the Chatelet; through vanity he changed his name to that of Voltaire, which he deemed more noble, more sonorous, and better suited to the reputation he aimed at: and never had there yet appeared a man with such talents, and such a thirst of dominion over the literary world. Gravity of manners, the spirit of meditation, or a genius leading to discussion and deep research, were unfortunately not among the gifts which Nature had lavished on him; and more unfortunately still, in his own heart were to be found all those passions which render abilities dangerous: from his early youth he seemed to direct them all at the overthrow of religion.

While only a student in rhetoric, in the college of Louis le Grand, he drew on himself the following rebuke from his professor, the Jesuit Le Jay, *Unfortunate young man, you will one day come to be the standard-bearer of Infidelity* \*. Never was oracle more literally fulfilled.

\* Life of Voltaire, edit. of Kell, and Feller's Hist. Di&c.

On

On leaving the college, he neither sought nor loved any other society, but that of men whose profligate morals could stimulate his incredulity. He was particularly intimate with Chaulieu the Anacreon of his day, the poet of voluptuousness; and with a few Epicureans who held their sittings at the Hotel de Vendôme. His first essays were in satire, which gave offence to government, and in tragedy, where we should have seen the rival of Corneille, Racine and Crebillon, had he not at the same time wished to rival Celsus and Porphyrius, with all the other enemies of religion. At a time when licentiousness in opinion still met with obstacles in France, he sought an asylum in England. He there found men whom the writings of Shaftesbury, commented on by Bolingbroke, had trained up to Deism. He mistook them for philosophers, and was persuaded that they alone were esteemed by the English. If he was not then mistaken, times since are greatly changed. All those sophisters whom Voltaire extols as the glory of Great Britain, if not forgotten, are more despised than read. Collins and Hobbes when remembered are classed with Tom Paine; an Englishman's good sense does not allow him to hate religion, or make an ostentatious display of impiety. With him nothing is less philosophical, notwithstanding his toleration and variety of creeds, than that affected hatred to Christianity which

B 2

marks

marks our Sophisters, and more particularly their conspiracies to overthrow it.

Philosophism is said to have first arisen in England. I deny the fact. Philosophism is the error of every man who, judging of every thing by the standard of his own reason, rejects in religious matters every authority that is not derived from the light of nature. It is the error of every man who denies the possibility of any mystery beyond the limits of his reason, of every man who, discarding revelation, in defence of the pretended rights of reason, their liberty and equality, seeks to subvert the whole fabric of the Christian religion.

Such an error may constitute a sect; the history of ancient Jacobinism demonstrates that the sect existed long since; but it had shrunk back to its dark abodes, when Voltaire appeared.

Such an error may be that of a few individuals. Many of the same sort had been broached during the two last centuries. Numerous were the sects which had sprung from Luther and Calvin, each making its partial attack on the ancient tenets of Christianity; when at length there arose a set of men attacking them all, and they would believe nothing. At first they were styled Libertines, the only name they deserved.

Voltaire might every where have met with some of those men, and more particularly at Paris  
under



under the regency of the Duke of Orleans, who was himself a monster of libertinism ; but, feeling the necessity of religion for the state, would not suffer it to be attacked in their publications.

It was in England, it is true, where, under their Collins and their Hobbes, the libertines first styled themselves Philosophers, and assumed the airs of deep thought, probably from some impious productions, which in any other part of Christendom would have enjoyed neither equal publicity nor impunity. But it may be certainly concluded, that Voltaire would every where have been, what he became in England ; he would have been so, at least, wherever, from the lenity of the laws, he could give vent to his insatiable thirst of dominion over the empire of science or letters.

It was in vain for him to aspire at the reputation of a Bossuet, a Pascal, or of that blaze of genius which had shone forth in the defence of religion ; but, hating their cause, and dazzled by their glory, he dared be jealous of their God ; at his empire he levelled his blows, and would be foremost in the ranks of the Philosophists.—He succeeded ; but, to keep his pre-eminence, blushed not to blend philosophy with impiety, and to compass the overthrow of religion. England however was the place where he first conceived a possibility of success. Condorcet, his adept, his confidant, his historian, and his panegyrist, asserts it in positive

terms: *There it was (in England) that Voltaire swore to dedicate his life to the accomplishment of that project; and he has kept his word\*.*

On his return to Paris, about the year 1730, he made so little secret of his design, he had published so many writings against Christianity, and was so sanguine in his hopes, that Mr. Herault, the Lieutenant of Police, upbraiding him one day with his impiety, and adding, *You may do or write what you please, you will never be able to destroy the Christian religion.* Voltaire without hesitation answered, *That is what we shall see †.*

Stimulated by the obstacles he met with, and seeing so much glory in his enterprize, he would not willingly have shared it with any body. "I am weary," he would say, "of hearing people repeat, that twelve men have been sufficient to establish Christianity, and I will prove that one may suffice to overthrow it ‡." When he uttered these words, his spite seemed to blind him to such a degree, as to hide from him the immense distance between the genius that creates, and the petty cunning of the mischievous monkey that destroys. The Sophister may conjure the clouds, or veil the world in darkness, but does not by that approach the God of truth. The virtues, the miracles, all the divine knowledge of the apostles, were necessary to teach man the path of life.

\* Life of Voltaire, edit. of Kell. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

Although

Although Voltaire in his outset flattered himself to enjoy alone the whole glory of the destruction of the Christian religion, which was his sole object; he nevertheless soon found that associates would be necessary. He even feared the noise of his undertaking, and hence resolved to move in the surer though humbler sphere of a conspirator. Already his numerous writings, either impious or obscene, had gained him many admirers and disciples, who, under the name of Philosophers, prided themselves in the hatred they bore to Christianity. Among these he chose D'Alembert as the most proper person to second him in his new plan of attack; and he chose well.

In the nobler theme, among the Sophisters we should compare Voltaire to Agamemnon, and D'Alembert to Ulysses. If the comparison be <sup>D'Alembert.</sup> too noble, see the latter cunning and cringing, even barking like the fox. Born of Fontenelle according to some, of Astruc the doctor according to others, his birth was always a secret to him. His mother was at the head of one of those societies of men of letters common in Paris, and she used to style them her beasts. Whether designed to hide his birth or not, is unknown; but certain it is, that in the night from the 16th to the 17th of November 1717, he was found, wrapped in swaddling cloaths, in the portico of the parish church of St. John; and hence

B 4

took

took the name of *Jean le Rond* at the Foundling Hospital whither he was carried and in which he was bred.

While yet a youth he enlisted under the banners of incredulity, repaying with ingratitude the church that had charitably reared him; with the small sums given him for his education, he sought, like many other young men, all those profligate works written against a religion whose proofs they almost flee from. Thus do wicked boys calumniate the kind master who thwarts their evil disposition.

Both his heart and mind naturally led him to be a disciple of Voltaire; even their diversity of character and the immense difference of talent, were soon confounded in their mutual bias to incredulity, and confirmed hatred to Christianity.

Voltaire was fiery, passionate and impetuous; D'Alembert cold, reserved, prudent and crafty: Voltaire fond of show, D'Alembert almost feared to be seen. The one, like the chief who is obliged to mask his battery, reluctantly used dissimulation, wished to wage open war with Christianity, *and die on a heap of Christians*, which he terms Bigots, *immolated at his feet*\*. The other, by instinct a dissembler, waged war like the partizan who, from behind his bushes, smiles to see his enemy fall into the snares he has laid †. Voltaire, so tran-

\* Letter from Voltaire to D'Alembert, 20th April 1761.

† Particularly Let. 100, from D'Alembert, 4th May 1762.  
scendent

scendent in polite literature, was but superficial in mathematicks. In the latter D'Alembert was profound, and owed his reputation to them : in every thing else he was a dry, finical, and perplexed writer, and is sometimes as low and vulgar as Voltaire is noble, easy and elegant ; he would plod to turn a bad epigram, while the latter would have wittily filled whole volumes.

Voltaire impudently daring, whether for or against, would quote the scriptures, history, or the holy fathers, affirming, inventing, or traducing the passage he wants ; for to wound was his only aim. D'Alembert carefully guards against the reply that may expose him ; his steps, mysterious and indirect, hide his design ; shrinking from refutation, if attacked he flies, concealing the fight lest he proclaim his defeat. Voltaire on the contrary seeks his enemies, calls to them ; though a hundred times defeated, he returns to the charge ; though his error be refuted, he will incessantly repeat it. It is not in defeat, but in flight alone that he sees disgrace ; and thus after a war of sixty years we still see him ranging on the field of battle.

D'Alembert seeks the smile of every little assembly ; and the applause of forty men in an academical circle constitutes his triumphal day ; while all the world, from London to St. Petersburg, from Sweden to America, to please Voltaire must found his fame.

D'Alem-

D'Alembert enlists from around him those secondary adepts; he trains them, initiates them, directs their missions, and holds petty correspondences. Voltaire will conjure kings, emperors, ministers and princes against his God; all must do homage to the sultan of incredulity. Among these latter, history must distinguish that Frederick, which it has yet only known by titles glorious to monarchs, whether conquerors or rulers.

Frederick II. In this Frederick II. the Solomon of the North according to the Sophisters, there are two distinct men. First, that King of Prussia, that hero less worthy of our admiration in the field of victory, displaying his vast military talents, than as the father of his people, giving life to agriculture and commerce, protecting the arts, counterpoising in some sort, by the justice and wisdom of his administration, those exploits perhaps more brilliant than just. In the second (so beneath a monarch) we see the Sophister, the philosophic pedant, the conspirator of incredulity; less cruel and enthusiastic than Julian the apostate, but more artful and perfidious.

It is painful to disclose the dark mysteries of this impious prince; but history must be true, and here especially. To trace the conspiracy against their thrones, kings must know what share their colleagues have had in the conspiracy against the altar.

Frederick,

Frederick, born with a mind worthy of a Celsus or his school, had not the help of a Justin or a Tertullian to guide his steps in religion, and was surrounded by its calumniators. While only Prince-royal he was in correspondence with Voltaire, and chiefly on religion or metaphysics; and even at that early age deemed himself a Philosopher; for he says—"To speak with my usual freedom, I must naturally own, that whatever regards the *God made man*, displeases me in the mouth of a Philosopher, who should be above popular error. Leave to *the great Corneille*, when *doating and fallen back to childhood*, the insipid task of versifying the *Imitation of Christ*; and whatever you may give us, let it be your own. We may speak of fables, but merely as fables; and a profound silence in my opinion should be kept, concerning those fables of the Christians, sanctified by time and the credulity of the absurd and stupid \*."

Even in his first letters there appears, with the ridiculous pride of a pedantic king, all the versatility and hypocrisy of a Sophister. Frederick denies, when Voltaire supports liberty †. With Voltaire, man is a pure machine; Frederick then maintains that man is free ‡. In one place we are free, precisely because we can form a clear idea of freedom §.

\* Let. 53, anno 1738.

† Let. of 16 Sept. 1771.

‡ Their letters in 1737.

§ Ibid.

In

In another, man is all matter; though one can hardly form a more confused idea, than that of matter thinking, free or arguing, though it were with Frederick's own versatility\*. He upbraids Voltaire with the praises he had bestowed on Christ, and three years after he is not ashamed to write—"For my part, I own that (however people may enlist under the banners of Fanaticism) I never shall. I may indeed compose a few Psalms to give a good opinion of my orthodoxy. Socrates incensed the household Gods, so did Cicero, and he was not credulous. We must give way to the fancies of a frivolous people, to avoid persecution and blame. For after all what is most desirable in this world is to live in peace; let us then live foolishly with fools, that we may live quietly †."

The same Frederick had written, that the Christian religion *yielded none but poisonous weeds* ‡; and Voltaire had congratulated him, *as having above all Princes fortitude of soul, sufficient insight and knowledge, to see that for the seventeen hundred years past the CHRISTIAN SECT had never done any thing but harm* §, when we afterward find him the opponent of that work of Philosophic insight, or rather so infamously profligate, *the System of Nature*. "One could be tempted," says he, "to accuse its author of

\* Let. of 4th Dec. 1775.

† Let. of 7th Jan. 1740.

‡ Let. to Voltaire 143, anno 1766.

§ Let. of 5th April 1764.

"want



“ want of sense and skill when, calumniating the  
 “ Christian religion, he imputes to it failings that  
 “ it has not. How can he with truth assert that  
 “ religion can be the cause of the misfortunes of  
 “ mankind ! He would have been more correct,  
 “ had he simply said, that the ambition and self-  
 “ interest of men, cloaked under the veil of reli-  
 “ gion, had sought to disturb the world and gratify  
 “ their passions. What then is reprehensible in the  
 “ morals of the commandments ? Were there in  
 “ the whole Gospel but this single precept, *Do as*  
 “ *thou wouldst be done by*, we should be obliged to  
 “ confess that those few words contained the whole  
 “ quintessence of morality :—The forgiveness of  
 “ injuries, charity, humanity, were not these preach-  
 “ ed by Jesus in his excellent sermon on the  
 “ mount \* ?”

In writing this, how much Frederick had lost of  
 that insight, that knowledge which had so lately  
 distinguished him from other princes ! But strange  
 to say, after having seen religion in so clear a light,  
 he compliments Voltaire on being its scourge †,  
 he still communicates his plans for its destruction ‡,  
 and foresees, that should it be preserved and pro-  
 tected in France, *the fine arts and higher sciences must*

\* Examination of the System of Nature, by Frederick,  
 King of Prussia.

† Letter of 13th Aug. 1773.    ‡ Let. 20th July 1775.

*fall,*

*fall, and that the rust of superstition will completely destroy a people, otherwise amiable and born for society\*.*

Had our sophistical monarch really foreseen events, he would have seen *that* people, *otherwise amiable and born for society*, when it had lost its religion, terrifying all Europe with its horrid deeds. But, like Voltaire, he was to be the sport of his pretended wisdom, as he was of his philosophy; and though we shall often see him judging shrewdly of the adepts, we shall always find him conspiring with them against the religion of Christ.

The correspondence that so well developes the characters of the royal adept, and of his idol Voltaire, begins in 1736; it was uninterrupted during their lives, some few years of the idol's disgrace excepted. It is in this correspondence that we must study him, incredulous and impious; divesting himself of his royal insignia, he is more emulous of the Philosophist, than he was jealous of the Cæsars; and to rival Voltaire becomes his servile copyist. A poet beneath mediocrity, a metaphysician on the lower ranks, he excels in but two things, his admiration for Voltaire, and his impiety, often worse than that of his master.

In consideration of this homage, this zeal, Voltaire overlooked his caprice, the rough usage he sometimes met with, even to the correction of the

\* Letter to Voltaire, 30th July 1777.

cane inflicted on him at Frankfort by a major by order of the despotic Sophister. It was too essential for the sect to continue the support of a royal adept, and we shall see how very much he served them. But first, in order to fathom their mutual hatred to Christianity, let us attend to the vast obstacles they overcame; let us hear Voltaire pathetically describing his sufferings at Berlin, a few years after his arrival, in a letter to Mad. Denis, his niece and confidant. He says, "La Metrie in his Prefaces may extol his extreme felicity in being with a great king, who sometimes reads his poetry to him; yet in private he weeps with me; he would willingly return though it were on foot. But why am I here? I will astonish you. This La Metrie, a man of no consequence, chats familiarly with the king when their readings are over—He speaks to me with confidence. He declared to me that talking to the king a few days ago of my supposed favor, and of the jealousy it excites, the king had answered, *I shall certainly not want him above a twelve-month longer; we squeeze the orange and throw away the rind . . . .* I made him repeat these consolatory words, I questioned him again and again, but he only reiterated his declaration.—I have done my utmost not to believe La Metrie; and yet, in reading  
 " over

“ over the king’s verses I found an epistle to one  
 “ of his painters called Père, it begins thus :

“ *Quel spectacle étonnant vient de frapper mes yeux ?*

“ *Cher Père, ton pinceau, t’égale au rang des dieux.*

“ Tell me what sight has struck my wond’ring eyes ?

“ Thy skill, dear Père, with gods immortal vies.

“ Now this Père is a fellow whom he takes no  
 “ notice of, and yet he is the *dear Père*, he is a  
 “ God ; he may perhaps see me in the same light,  
 “ and that is not saying much.—You may easily  
 “ guess what reflexions, what a recoil upon my-  
 “ self and what perplexity, in a word what trouble  
 “ this declaration of La Mettrie’s has created  
 “ within me \*.”

This first letter was soon succeeded by a second,  
 as follows : “ My sole views at present are, to  
 “ desert in a genteel manner, to take care of my  
 “ health, to see you again, and forget this three  
 “ years dream. I plainly perceive the orange has  
 “ been squeezed ; I must think of saving the rind.  
 “ For my own instruction I will compile a diction-  
 “ ary for the use of kings. *My friend*, signifies  
 “ *my slave* ; *my dear friend*, is to say, *you are to*  
 “ *me more than indifferent* : you are to understand  
 “ *by I will make you happy, I will bear with you as*  
 “ *long as I shall have need for you ; sup with me*  
 “ *to-night*, means *I will make game of you to-night* ;

\* Let. to Mad. Denis, Berlin 2d Sept. 1752.

“ This

" This dictionary might be of some length, and  
 " not unworthy a place in the Encyclopædia.  
 " Seriously this distresses me. Can there be truth  
 " in what I have seen? To delight in making  
 " mischief among those that live with him! To  
 " say every thing that is gracious to a person,  
 " and write pamphlets against him! To force a  
 " man from his country by the most endearing  
 " and solemn promises, and treat him with the  
 " blackest malice! What contrasts! And this is the  
 " man who wrote in such a philosophic strain, and  
 " whom I mistook for a Philosopher! and I styled  
 " him *the Solomon of the North*! Do you remem-  
 " ber that fine letter, which never pleased you?  
 " You are a Philosopher, said he, and so am I.  
 " Upon my word, Sire, as to Philosophers, we  
 " are neither of us so \*."

Voltaire never was more correct; neither Fre-  
 deric nor he could pretend to Philosophy in its  
 true acceptation; but they might eminently so in  
 the sense of the conspirators, with whom impiety  
 and hatred to Christianity was its only essence.

It was soon after writing this last letter, that  
 Voltaire stole away from the court of his disciple,  
 and received at Frankfort the *correction* which  
 made him the laughing-stock of all Europe. Es-  
 tablished however at Ferney, he soon forgot his  
 bastinado, and Frederic was once more the *Solomon*

\* Letter to Mad. Denis, 18th Dec. 1752.

*of the North*, who returns the compliment by saluting him as the Father of Philosophy. Though not in friendship, they were soon united in their mutual hatred to Christianity; and though they never met again, their plans were more easily formed and intelligently conducted in their future correspondence.

**Diderot.** As to Diderot, he spontaneously threw himself into the arms of the conspirators. A heated brain, an enthusiastic rage for that Philosophism of which Voltaire had set the fashion, a disorderly confusion of ideas (the more evident, as both his speech and pen followed all the explosions of his brain), pointed him out to D'Alembert as a man essential to the conspiracy, and who would say, or could be made to say, such things as he dared not speak himself. They were both, until death, as firmly united to Voltaire, as the latter was to Frederic.

Uncertainty of the chiefs in their philosophical opinions.

If there had been any thing but chaos to have succeeded to Christianity, had there been any doctrine whatsoever to have been substituted, never were four men less fitted for such an undertaking.

Voltaire leaned to Deism, and seemed for some time to have adopted it; but, insensibly falling into Spinoza's systems, he knew not what to believe. Consulting at one time D'Alembert, at another Frederic, he was torn with remorse during the remainder of his life; if doubts and anguish of mind, void of repentance, can be called remorse. At nearly  
four score

four score he expresses himself in the following uncertain manner: "Doubts encompass us around, *and doubting is a disagreeable state.* Is there a God such as he is said to be? A soul such as is imagined? Analogies such as laid down? Is there any thing to be hoped for after this life? Was Gilimer in the right to laugh, though stript of his dominions, when brought before Justinian, or Cato preferring suicide to the sight of Cæsar. Is glory then but an illusion? Shall Mustapha in the effeminacy of his harem, beaten, ignorant, proud and committing every folly, be happier provided he digests well, than the philosopher who digests ill? Are all beings equal before the great Being that animates nature? In that case could the soul of Ravaillac be equal to that of Henry IV. or had they neither of them a soul? May the heroic philosophers unravel all this; for my part I can make nothing of it \*."

D'Alembert and Frederick alternately pressed by these questions, each answered after his own way. Unable to fix his own uncertainty the former frankly confesses he has not the gift of solving them: "I own to you," says he, "that concerning the existence of God, the Author of the *System of Nature* seems too resolute and dogmatic,

\* Letter 179, 12th Oct. 1770.

“ and on this subject scepticism seems the most  
 “ rational. *What do we know about it*, is with  
 “ me, an answer to most metaphysical questions,  
 “ and the consequent reflection must be, that since  
 “ we know nothing of the matter, it is doubtless  
 “ unnecessary that we should know more\*.”

This reflection on the little importance of these questions, was added, left Voltaire, harrassed out with the anguish of his mind, should forsake a philosophy unable to solve his doubts on questions, by no means, in his opinion, indifferent to the happiness of man. He insisted, but D'Alembert persisting in the same style, says that “ *No*,  
 “ in metaphysics, appeared to him not much wiser  
 “ than *yes*; and that *non liquet* (it is not clear) was  
 “ generally the only rational answer†.”

Frederick was as averse to doubts as Voltaire, but perpetually wishing to stifle them, he was at length persuaded he had succeeded. “ A philosopher of my acquaintance,” says he, “ a man  
 “ pretty resolute in his opinions, thinks that we  
 “ have a sufficient degree of probability, to constitute a certainty that *post mortem nihil est* (or  
 “ that death is an eternal sleep), he maintains that  
 “ man is not twofold, that he is only matter  
 “ animated by motion; and this strange man says,

\* Letter 36, anno 1770.

† Letter 38, *ibid*.

“ that



“ that there exists no relation between *animals* and  
 “ the supreme *intelligence* \*.”

This resolute philosopher, this strange man, was Frederick himself, and a few years after, he makes no secret of it, when he more decidedly writes, “ I am well assured that I am not twofold; hence, I consider myself as a single being. I know that I am an animal organised and that thinks; hence, I conclude that matter can think, as well as <sup>th, at</sup> it has the property of being electric †.”

Verging towards his grave, but wishing to inspire Voltaire with confidence, he writes anew. “ The gout has successively ran over all my body. Our frail machine must needs be destroyed by time, which consumes every thing; my foundations are undermined, but all that, gives me very little concern ‡.”

As to the fourth hero of the conspiracy, the famous Diderot, he is exactly the person, whose decisions against God, D'Alembert had found too resolute and dogmatic, though oftentimes, in the same work, we find him after deciding against the Deist, deciding in the same peremptory manner for or against the Sceptic and the Atheist. But whether he writes for or against a God, he always appears impervious to doubts or anguish of mind.

\* Letter of 30th Oct. 1770. † Letter of 4th Dec. 1775.

‡ Letter 8th Apr. 1776.

He fairly wrote what he thought at the moment he held his pen, whether *he crushed the atheist with the weight of the universe*, and that *the eye of a mite, the wing of a butterfly* was sufficient to defeat them \*, or when *that glorious display did not give him even the most distant idea of any thing divine* †, and that this universe was but the *fortuitous result of motion and matter* ‡; whether, when the existence of God was to be left in doubt, *scepticism at all times and in all places, could alone preserve us from the two opposite excesses* §, or when he prays God for the sceptics, because he sees *they all want light* ||; whether in fine to form a sceptic, *it was necessary to have a head as well organised as that of Montagne the philosopher* \*\*.

Never was there a man so peremptory when affirming or denying any point, so perfectly void of constraint or trouble, so impervious to remorse; he was a perfect stranger to them even when he positively says that, *between him and his dog he knows of no other difference but their dress* ††.

With these extravagancies in their religious opinions we find, Voltaire impious and tormented by his doubts and ignorance; D'Alembert impious

\* Philosophical Thoughts, No. 20.

† The Code of Nature.

‡ Philosophical Thoughts, No. 21.

§ Idem, No. 33. || Idem, No. 22. \*\* Idem, No. 28.

†† Life of Seneca, page 377.

but

but calm in his; while Frederick impious and triumphant, or thinking he had triumphed over his ignorance, left God in heaven provided there were no souls on earth; and Diderot, by turns, Atheist, Materialist, Deist or Sceptic, but ever impious, ever frantic, the better fitted for the various parts he was doomed to act.

Such were the men whose characters and religious errors, were necessary to be known, to ascertain the conspiracy of which they were the chiefs, and of whose existence we shall give undeniable proof, indicate its precise object, and unfold its means and future progress.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the Object, Extent, and Existence of the  
Antichristian Conspiracy.*

The true  
character-  
istics of  
a conspi-  
racy.

TO say that there existed a conspiracy against the Christian religion, of which Voltaire, D'Alembert, Frederick II. King of Prussia, and Diderot, were the chief authors and instigators, is not simply to say, that each one of them was an enemy and that their writings tended to the destruction of the religion of Christ; for both before and after them, we have seen enemies to this same religion, seeking to spread, by their writings, the venom of incredulity. France has had her Bayle, and her Montesquieu; the first a true sophister, undecided in his principles and supporting the *pro* and *con* with equal versatility; but destitute of that hatred, which constitutes the conspirator, and seeks accomplices: the latter is but a youth when he writes his *Persian Letters*, and has no fixed principle against that faith, to which he will one day do homage, by declaring that *he always respected religion*, and that he beheld the Gospel, *as the fairest gift that God had bestowed on man* \*.

\* Vid. Montesquieu, Feller's Hist. Dict.

England

England has seen her Hobbes, her Woolstons or her Collins, with many other disciples of incredulity; but each of these sophisters was impious in his own way, and they sought not to league together, however much Voltaire and Condorcet may assert the contrary. Each makes his partial attack on Christianity from his own brain, and that is not sufficient to constitute a conspiracy.

In order to show a real conspiracy against Christianity, we must not only point out the wish to destroy, but also the union and secret correspondence in the means employed to attack, debase or annihilate it. When therefore I name Voltaire and Frederick, Diderot and D'Alembert, as the chiefs of this Antichristian Conspiracy, I not only mean to shew, that each had impiously written against Christianity, but that they had formed the wish, and had secretly communicated that wish of destroying the religion of Christ; that they had acted in concert, sparing no political nor impious art to effectuate this destruction; that they were the instigators and conductors of those secondary agents whom they had misled, and following up their plans and projects, with all that ardor and constancy, which denotes the most finished conspirator. My very proofs shall be drawn from what we may very properly term the records of the conspiracy, I mean from their most intimate  
corre-

The true  
archives  
of the  
conspirators.

correspondence, a long time secret, or from their own assertions contained in their divers writings.

When Beaumarchais gave us a compleat edition of Voltaire's works, with all the magnificence of the Baskerville type; either the adepts, blinded by their success, were persuaded that the publicity of this monstrous conspiracy, could only add new lustre to its chief, or that the Editors themselves were ignorant of the fact, or in fine, that being scattered and dispersed through forty large volumes of letters, to all sorts of persons, and on all sorts of subjects, no man could at once seize the thread of a conspiracy, the work of many long years. But whatever may have been their intentions, whatever their art in suppressing parts of the correspondence, they have not effectually done away all means of discovery. Never should I have undertaken a work of such labour, so painful and disgusting, had I not seen the necessity of proving from the very records of the conspirators, the reality of their plots; the necessity of denouncing to all nations, with proof in hand, the men, who wish to mislead them, and who sought to overturn every altar provided it was but Christian. With them the altars of London or Geneva, of Stockholm or Petersburg were to share the same fate with those of Paris or Madrid, of Vienna or Rome, thus adding, by their fall, a new, though tardy proof of the universality of this conspiracy. Such  
then

then are their black and hidden crimes. Behold them conspiring against your God, in order to conspire against your sovereign and your laws, behold them seeking to overthrow all civil society and universally extend the scourges of the French revolution.

I know that the gravity of the charge requires strong evidence and clear proofs, to justify it; if then my proofs are too numerous, let my reader reflect on the weightiness of the charge.

In all conspiracies there is generally a secret language or a watchword, unintelligible to the vulgar, though it perpetually recalls the object to the mind of the conspirator. The word chosen by Voltaire must have been dictated by some fiend of hatred or frantic rage. But what words! *Crush the wretch!* (*écrasez l'infame!*) and what a signification is attached to these three words in the mouths of D'Alembert, of Frederick or their disciples; constantly they mean *crush Christ, crush the religion of Christ, crush every religion that adores Christ*. Oh readers retain your indignation until you have seen the proof!

The word of the conspirators.

When Voltaire complains that the adepts are not sufficiently united in the war they wage against the *wretch*; when he wishes to revive their zeal, he recalls to their minds, the hopes and projects he had already conceived in 1730, when the lieutenant of the police at Paris, warned him that he would

Proofs as to the true sense of the word with Voltaire.

would not succeed in overturning the Christian religion, he had daringly, answered *that is what we shall see* \*.

When exulting in the success of the war, and progress of the conspiracy against the *wretch*, he triumphs in the idea, “ that in Geneva, Calvin’s own town, there are but a few beggarly fellows who believe in the consubstantial †.”

When he wishes, during this war against the *wretch*, to give his reasons for tolerating the Soci-nians, it is, says he, *because Julian would have favoured them, and that he hates what Julian hated, and despises what he (Julian) despised* ‡.

What then is this hatred, common to the Soci-nians and to Julian the apostate, if it be not their hatred to the divinity of Christ. What is meant by the consubstantial, fallen into disrepute, if it be not Christ; or how can the word *wretch*, be otherwise interpreted, in the mouth of him that had uttered, “ I am weary of hearing people repeat that twelve men have been sufficient to establish Christianity, and I will prove that one may suffice to overthrow it §.” In the mouth I say of a man who, in his intrigues against the *wretch* exclaims, “ could not five or six men of parts, and who rightly understood each other,

\* Let. to D’Alembert, 20th of June 1760.

† Let. 119, anno 1763, 28th Sept.

‡ Let. to Frederick, 5th Nov. 1773.

§ Life of Voltaire by Condorcet.

“ succeed,



“ succeed, after the example of twelve scoundrels  
 “ who have already succeeded \*.”

In the mouth of this frantic infidel can we conceal the sense of these words: The twelve apostles called *twelve scoundrels*! and their divine master a *wretch*! I may dwell too much on the proofs, but the charges are too heinous, to pass them over lightly.

All those men, so much extolled by Voltaire for their ardor in *crushing the wretch*, are precisely those who attacked Christianity without the least decorum or decency, such as Diderot, Condorcet, Helvetius, Freret, Boulanger, Dumarfais and such like infidels; and those <sup>whom</sup> which he particularly wishes D'Alembert to rally, the more effectually *to crush the wretch*, are [namely] the Atheists, the Deists and Spinofists †.

Against whom then will the Atheist, the Deist and the Spinofist coalesce, unless it be against the God of the Gospel?

Voltaire proceeds to direct the zeal of the conspirators against the holy fathers, and those modern writers, who have written in defence of Christianity and the divinity of Christ, both of whom he wishes to see treated with the utmost contempt; he writes to his adepts, “ Victory is declaring for us  
 “ on all sides, and I can assure you, that soon, none

\* Let. to D'Alembert 24th July 1760.

† Let. 37th to D'Alembert, 1770.

“ but

“ but the rabble will follow the standard of our  
 “ enemies, and we equally condemn that rabble  
 “ whether for or against us. . We are a corps  
 “ of brave knights, defenders of the truth and  
 “ who admit none amongst us, but men of  
 “ education. Courage brave Diderot, intrepid  
 “ D’Alembert, form with my dear Damilaville  
 “ and rush forward on those fanatics and knaves,  
 “ pity poor Paschal, but despise Houtville and  
 “ Abadie as much as if they were fathers of the  
 “ church \*.”

Here then is the explanation of what Voltaire means *by crushing the wretch*. It is to undo what the apostles have done, to hate what Julian the apostate hated, to attack those, whom the deists, atheists and spinosists always attacked, it is in fine to rush on the holy fathers or on any other man who dares defend the religion of Christ.

With Frederick The sense of this atrocious watchward is equally clear in the mouth of Frederick. With this royal sophister as with Voltaire, *Christianity, the Christian sect, the Christicole superstition* (La superstition Christicole) and *the wretch*, are all synonymous terms. With him as with Voltaire *the wretch yielded none but poisonous weeds*, the best writings against *the wretch* are precisely the most impious, and if any in particular deserve his peculiar esteem, it is, *that since Celsus, nothing so striking had been pub-*

\* Let. to Damilaville, anno 1763.

*lished*

*libel* against Christianity. The fact really is, that Boulanger, unfortunately more known by his impiety than by his conversion, is *still superior to Celsus himself* \*.

As to D'Alembert we may see, though he seldom uses this shocking word, that he was well acquainted with its meaning; by his answers to Voltaire, by the means he suggests, by the writings he approves of and seeks to circulate, as fittest *to crush the wretch*; and which writings are precisely those that more directly tend to eradicate religion from the minds of the people. We may see it, when wishing to shew his zeal for the progress of the conspiracy against *the wretch*, he professes his eagerness to support Voltaire, or his sorrow that from localities, he cannot speak with the same freedom against Christianity. His expressions and numberless letters hereafter quoted, will leave no more doubt of him, than of Voltaire or Frederick†.

Such was the general acceptance of the word among all the conspirators; Condorcet, even laying aside the word *wretch*, positively asserts, that Voltaire had sworn, *to crush Christianity* ‡, and Mercier says *to crush Christ* §.

With  
D'Alembert.

Extent of  
the conspiracy.

\* See let. of the King of Prussia, No. 143, 145, 153, anno 1767, &c. &c. &c.

† See D'Alembert's letters, 100, 102, 151.

‡ Life of Voltaire.

§ Mercier's letters. No. 60 of M. Pelletier.

In

In the views of the conspirators, *to crush Christ* was not too strong an expression. In the extent of their projects, no shadow of his worship was to remain: it is true that among the Christians, they honored the church of Rome with their chief hatred. But Luther and Calvin, the Church of England or of Geneva, though separated from Rome, had retained their belief of Christ, and were therefore to share the fate of the former.

The whole Gospel of Calvin, is ridiculed by Voltaire, *as the fooleries of Jean Chauvin*\*, and it was of these fooleries he speaks when writing to D'Alembert he says, *that in Calvin's own town (Geneva) there were but a few beggarly fellows who believed in the consubstantial*, that is to say, *who believed in Christ*. He particularly exults in the approaching fall of the Church of England, when he extols *the English truths* †, that is the impieties of Hume, or when he thought himself authorized to write, that *in London Christ was spurned* ‡.

Those disciples who paid him the homage of their philosophic science, adopting his style, write, " I don't like Calvin, he was intolerant, and poor  
" Servet fell a victim to him, and it is true he is  
" no more spoken of at Geneva than if he had  
" never existed. As to Luther, though he had not

\* Let. to Damilaville, Aug. 18th, 1766.

† Let. to the Marquis D'Argence, April 28, 1760.

‡ Let. to D'Alembert, Sept. 28th, 1763.

" much

“ much wit, as is easily perceived by his writings,  
 “ he did not persecute, and only loved wine and  
 “ women \* ?”

It is even observable, that for a considerable time the conspiring sophisters placed particular satisfaction in their successes against the Protestant churches. With what excessive joy Voltaire would write, that England and Switzerland were over-run with men *who bated and despised* Christianity, as *Julian* the apostate *bated and despised it* †, and that *from Geneva to Berne not a Christian was to be found* ‡. Frederick on his side, writes with equal joy, *In our protestant countries we go on much brisker* §.

Such then was the extent of this conspiracy ; they were to overturn every altar where Christ was adored. An historian might have been misled in seeing the adepts solicit, more than once, the recall of the Protestants into France ; but at the very time that Voltaire writes, how much he laments to see the petition made by the minister Choiseul rejected, fearing lest his disciples should imagine he wished to spare the Huguenot more than the Catholic, he hastens to add, that the Huguenots and the Calvinists *are not less mad than the Sorbonists or the Catholics*, that they were even *raving mad* ||;

\* Let. of the Langrave of Hesse to Voltaire, Sept. 9th 1766.

† Let. to the King of Prussia, 15th Nov. 1773.

‡ Let. to D'Alembert, Feb. 8th 1776.

§ Let. 143.      || Let. to Marmontel, 21st Aug. 1767.

Vol. 1.

D

may,

may, sometimes he saw *nothing more atrabilarious and ferocious than the Huguenots* \*.

All this pretended zeal of the conspirators to calvinize France, was but as a preparatory step to de-Christianize it with greater expedition. We may trace the gradation of their intended progress, in the following words of D'Alembert to Voltaire: "For my part I see every thing in the brightest colours, I already behold toleration established, *the Protestants recalled*, the priests married, confession abolished, and fanaticism crushed, *without so much as its being perceived* †." *Fanaticism and wretch* in D'Alembert's mouth are synonymous, the latter is even made use of in the same letter, both meaning *Christ or his whole religion crushed*.

There is however an exception often made by Voltaire, which might have left Christ some few worshippers among the rabble. He seems little jealous of that conquest, when he writes to D'Alembert, "Both you and Damilaville must be well pleased, to see the contempt into which *the wretch* is fallen among the better sort of people throughout Europe. *They are all we wished for*, or that were necessary. We never pretended to enlighten *the bouse maids and shoemakers*; we leave them to the apostles ‡." Or when he writes to Diderot, "Whatever you do, have your eye on *the wretch*."

\* Let. to the Marquis D'Argence de Dirac, Mar. 2d 1763.

† May 4th 1762.

‡ Sept. 2d 1768.

"It

“ *It must be destroyed among the better sort and leave it to the rabble for whom it was made* \* ;” or when, in fine, he writes to Damilaville, “ I can assure you, that soon none but the rabble will follow the standard of our enemies, and we equally condemn that rabble whether for or against us † .”

Voltaire, despairing of wider success, would sometimes except *the clergy and the great chamber of the Parliament*. But in the sequel of these memoirs, we shall see the conspirators actively extending their principles, and instilling their hatred against Christianity into every class of men, from the cottage to the throne, not even excepting their so much despised rabble.

\* Dec. 25th 1762.

† Anno 1765.

D 2

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*The Secret, the Union and the Epoch of the Conspiracy.*

IN conspiracies it is not enough for the agents to have a particular watchword, or formula, in order to hide their general object, but they have also peculiar names, by which they mutually point out each other, and which are unintelligible to the public. They carefully conceal their correspondence; but if they fear discovery, it is then they use these precautions lest their names, or the object of the plot, be exposed.

The supposed names of the conspirators. These means were not to be neglected by Voltaire or D'Alembert. In their correspondence Frederick is often called *Duluc* \*, D'Alembert *Protagoras* †, though he often styles himself *Bertrand* ‡. Both were well applied to him, the former to denote the infidel, the latter to betoken the means of his impiety, by the shifts of Bertrand, in Fontaine's fable of the Monkey and the Cat: when D'Alembert is Bertrand (the monkey), Voltaire is Raton §

\* Let. of D'Alembert, No. 77.

† Voltaire to Thiriot, 26th Jan. 1762.

‡ Let. 90.

§ Let. 22d, March, 1774.

(the



(the cat). Diderot personates Plato or Tomplat \*, and the general term for the conspirators, is *Cacouac* †. They say he is a good Cacouac, when he can be perfectly depended upon. Oftentimes, and particularly by Voltaire, they are called brothers as in masonry. They also give peculiar imports to whole phrases of their enigmatical language, for example, *the vine of Truth is well cultivated*, is to say we make amazing progress against religion ‡.

Their secret language.

This secret language was particularly made use of, when they feared their letters were opened or stopped, which often gave Voltaire and D'Alembert great uneasiness. It was for that reason, that many of their letters, were directed to fictitious persons, to merchants or some clerk in office, who was in the secret. It does not appear that they ever made use of cyphers, they would have been much too tedious, considering Voltaire's immense correspondence. Those were reserved for conspirators, not less ardent, but of a deeper policy. False directions and not signing their names, seem to have given them sufficient confidence in their style, and if perchance, any of their letters are more enigmatical than common, they are easily explained by the preceding or following ones. It

\* Voltaire to Damilaville, 25th August, 1766.

† Let. of D'Alembert, No. 76.

‡ Let. to D'Alembert, No. 35.

was by these shifts they wished to leave an opening for excusing or explaining what they had already written; but they are not sufficiently obscure to prevent discovery, and that with very little trouble, when surprised.

Some few, nevertheless, are more difficult to be understood than others; for example, the letter written by Voltaire to D'Alembert, the 30th of January 1764: "My illustrious philosopher has sent me the letter of Hippias, B. This letter of B, proves that there are T.'s and that poor literature is falling back into the shackles which *Maleherbes* had broken. That demi-scholar as well as demi-citizen, D'Aguesseau, was a T.... He would have hindered the nation from thinking! I wish you had but seen that brute of a *Maboul*, he was a very silly T... to be at the head of the customs upon ideas under the T... D'Aguesseau. Then followed the under T.'s about half a dozen miserable rascals, who for the pitiful salary of 17l. per annum, would erase from a book, every thing that was worth leaving in it."

Here it is evident that T stands for *tyrant*, one of which tyrants is the chancellor D'Aguesseau, the other *Maboul*, the comptroller of the press. The under T's, or tyrants, are the public censors, whose salaries were about 17l. per annum. As to *Hippias B*, his person is not so clear; he was most probably some tyrant who wished to stop the circulation

culatation of those works, which directly tended to the overthrow of the altar and the throne. But who can see, without indignation, the chancellor D'Aguesseau, the ornament of the magistracy, called a tyrant, a demi-scholar, a demi-citizen. It is, however, forbearance in Voltaire, not to abuse him more grossly ; we must expect to see him and D'Alembert lavishing the lowest terms of black-guardism, throughout this correspondence, on every man who differs from them in opinion, whatsoever be his merits otherwise, but especially on those who laboured for, or wrote in defence of religion.

However openly the conspirators expressed themselves to each other, secrecy was strictly recommended to them, with respect to the public ; and Voltaire perpetually apprizes the adepts of its importance. " The mysteries of Mytra, (he would make D'Alembert write to the adepts) are not to be divulged, the monster (religion) must fall, pierced by a hundred invisible hands ; yes, let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows\*."

This secrecy, nevertheless, was not to be so much with respect to the object of the conspiracy, as to the names of the conspirators, and the means they employed ; for it was impossible for the rancorous hatred of Voltaire, to disguise the wish of annihilating Christianity ; but he had to fear on one

\* Let. to D'Alembert, April 27th 1768.

sive the severity of the laws, and on the other the contempt and infamy which would certainly attach to himself and disciples, from the impudence of their falsehoods and the effrontery of their calumnies, had it ever been possible to trace their authors and abettors.

History is not in fault, if it is obliged to represent the chief of the conspiracy, at once the most daring, the most unrelenting in his hatred to Christ, and the most desirous of hiding his attacks. Voltaire secretly conspiring and concealing his means, is the same man, though bold and blaspheming. Openly attacking the altars of his God, he is still the Sophister, though veiling the hand that strikes, or seeking in the dark to undermine the temple. It is hatred that fires his rage, or leads him through the tortuous ways of the conspirator. To unmask this dissimulating man, shall be a leading point in the following memoirs.

In his character of chief, the mysteries of Mytra as well as the intrigues of the conspirators, could be of no small concern to him, and the following were his secret instructions. “ Confound *the wretch* to  
 Their lessons on the art of secrecy. “ the utmost of your power, speak your mind  
 “ boldly, strike *and conceal your hand*. You may be  
 “ known; I am willing to believe there are people  
 “ sufficiently keen-scented, but they will not be  
 “ able to convict you\*.”

\* Let. to D'Alembert, May 1761.

“ The

“ The Nile, it was said, spread around its fertilizing waters, though it concealed its head; *do you the same*, you will secretly enjoy your triumph. “ I recommend *the wretch to you* \*.” “ We embrace the worthy knight and exhort him to conceal his hand from the enemy †.”

No precept is oftener repeated by Voltaire than *strike but conceal the hand*, and if by indiscretion any adept occasioned his discovery, he would complain most bitterly, he would even deny works that were the most decidedly his. “ I know not why (says he) people are so obstinately bent on believing me the author of the *Philosophical Dictionary*. The greatest service you can do me, is to assert, though you pledge your share in Paradise, that I have no hand in that hellish work. There are three or four people, who perpetually repeat, that I have supported the good cause, and that I fight mortally against the wild beasts. *It is betraying one's brethren, to praise them on such an occasion, those good souls bless me, but ruin me*. It is certainly him, they say, it is his style, his manner. Ah, my brethren, what fatal accents; on the contrary you should cry out on the public ways, it is not he, *for the monster*

\* Let. to Helvetius, May 11th 1761.

† Let. to Mr. de Vielleville, 26th April 1767.

“ must

“ *must fall pierced by a hundred invisible bands ; yes,  
let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows \**.”

It was in this art of secrecy and of concealing his steps, that D'Alembert so much excelled. Him it was, that Voltaire recommended to the brethren for imitation, and *as the bope of the flock*. “ He is  
“ daring (would he say to them), but not rash ; he  
“ will make hypocrites tremble (that is religious  
“ men) without giving any hold against himself †.”

Frederick not only approved of this secrecy ‡, but we shall see him playing off all the artifices of his dark policy to ensure the success of the conspiracy.

Union of  
the con-  
spirators.

In every plot, union is as essential to the conspirator, as secrecy to the cause, and so it is often and particularly recommended. Among others we find the following instructions : “ Oh, my philosophers, we should march closed, as the Macedonian phalanx, it was only vanquished when it opened.  
“ Let the real philosophers unite in a brotherhood  
“ like the Free-masons ; let them assemble and  
“ support each other, let them be faithful to the  
“ association. Such an academy will be far superior to that of Athens, and to all those of  
“ Paris §.”

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 152 and 219.

† Let. from Voltaire to Thuriot, 19th Nov. 1760.

‡ Let. to Voltaire, 16th May 1771.

§ Let. to D'Alembert, No. 85 anno 1761, and No. 2, anno 1769.

If

If any diffention, perchance, happened among the conspirators, the chief immediately wrote to appease them : he would say, " Ah poor brethren, " the primitive Christians behaved themselves " much better than we do. Patience, do not let " us lose courage, God will help us provided we " remain united," and when he wished to insist more particularly on the object of that union, he would repeat his answer to Herault, *We'll see whether it be true, that the Christian religion cannot be destroyed*\*.

Most of these diffentions arose from the difference of opinion in the conspirators, and the discordancy of their sophisms against Christianity, which often made them thwart each other. Voltaire, aware of the advantage it gave to religious writers, immediately enjoined D'Alembert to seek, if possible, a reconciliation with the Atheists, Deists and Spinofists. " The two parties (says he) must " necessarily coalesce. I wish you would undertake " that reconciliation ; say to them, if you will omit " the emetic, I will overlook the bleeding †."

This premier chief, always fearful lest their ardor should subside, and wishing to animate their zeal, would write to the other chiefs, " I fear you are " not sufficiently zealous, you bury your talents, " you seem only to contemn whilst you should ab-

Ardor  
and con-  
stancy in  
the plot.

\* Let. to D'Alembert, No. 66.

† Let. to D'Alembert, No. 37, 1770.

" hor

“ hor and destroy the monster. Could not you  
 “ crush him in a few pages, while you modestly  
 “ hide from him, that he falls by your pen. It  
 “ was given Melcager to kill the boar; *burl the*  
 “ *javelin, but bide your band.* Comfort me in my  
 “ old age \*.” He would write to a young adept,  
 who might be dejected through ill success, *Cou-*  
*rage! do not let yourself be dejected* †. In fine, to  
 bind them by the strongest ties of interest, he would  
 tell them by means of D’Alembert, “ Such is our  
 “ situation that we shall be the execration of man-  
 “ kind, if we have not the better sort of people  
 “ on our side. We must then gain them, cost  
 “ what it will; labour therefore in the vineyard,  
 “ *and crush the wretch, then crush the wretch* ‡.”

Open  
 avowal of  
 Voltaire.

It is thus that every distinctive mark which constitutes the conspirator, such as enigmatical language, a common and secret wish, union, ardor and perseverance, is to be seen in these first authors of the war against Christianity. It is thus that the historian is authorised to represent this coalition of Sophisters, as a true conspiracy against the altar. At length Voltaire not only allows it, but wishes every adept to understand, that the war of which he was the chief, was a true plot, and that

\* Let. to D’Alembert, 28th Sept. 1763.

† Let. to Damilaville.

‡ 13th Feb. 1764.

each



each one was to ~~act~~ the part of a conspirator. When he feared their excessive zeal, he would write himself, or through D'Alembert, that in the war they waged, *they were to act as conspirators and not as zealots* \*.

When the chief of these infidels makes so formal a declaration, when he so clearly orders them to *act as conspirators*, it would be absurd to seek further proofs, as to the existence of the conspiracy. I fear they have already been too numerous for my reader; but in a matter of such importance, I was to presume him equally rigid as myself, with respect to its demonstration. Now as nobody will deny this, unless blind to conviction, to have been a real conspiracy of the Sophisters against Christ and his church, I will not end this chapter, without trying to ascertain its origin and true epoch.

Was this conspiracy to be dated from the day on which Voltaire consecrated his life to the annihilation of Christianity, we should look back to the year 1728, that being the epoch of his return from London to France; and his most faithful disciples inform us, that he made his determination when in England †. But Voltaire lived many years, alone ruminating his hatred against Christ; it is

Epoch of  
the con-  
spiracy.

\* Voltaire to D'Alembert, let. 142.

† Life of Voltaire, edit. of Kell.

true

true he was already the officious defender of every impious work that had the same tendency, but these were only the isolated works of Sophisters, singly writing, without any of the appurtenances of the conspirator. To form adepts and instil his hatred into them, could be but the work of time, and his efforts, unfortunately crowned with success, had greatly augmented their number, when, in 1750, he by the express desire of the king of Prussia, took his departure for Berlin. Of all the disciples he left in Paris, the most zealous were D'Alembert and Diderot, and it is to these two men, that the coalition against Christ can be first traced. Though it may not have acquired all its strength, it certainly existed when the plan of the Encyclopedia was decided on; that is to say, the year that Voltaire left Paris for Berlin. Voltaire had formed his disciples, but it was D'Alembert and Diderot who united them in one body to make that famous compilation, which may in truth be styled the grand arsenal of impiety, whence all their sophisticated arms, were to be directed against Christianity.

Voltaire, who alone was worth a host of infidels, laboring apart in the war against Christianity, left the Encyclopedists, for some time, to their own schemes; but if his disciples had been able to form the coalition, they were incapable of carrying it on. Their difficulties augmenting, they fought a  
man

man able to remove them, and without hesitation fixed on Voltaire, or rather, to use the words of his historian, *Voltaire, by his age, his reputation and his genius, naturally became their chief.*

At his return from Prussia, about the year 1752, he found the conspiracy complete. Its precise object was the destruction of Christianity; the chief had first sworn it, the secondary chiefs, such as D'Alembert, Diderot and even Frederick, notwithstanding his quarrels with the premier, were ever after leagued with him in the same bonds. At this period, the adepts were all that Voltaire could number, as his disciples: but from the day of the coalition between the premier, the secondary chiefs, and the adepts' agents or protectors; from the day that the object of this coalition to crush Christ and his religion, under the appellation of *wretch*, had been decreed, until the grand object of the coalition was to be consummated by the proscriptions and horrid massacres of the Jacobins, near half a century was to elapse; for so much time was necessary for the harbinger of blood and corruption, to prepare the way for the Philosopher of destruction and murder. Naturally during this long period of time, we shall see this sophistical sect, who had sworn to crush, coalescing with the sect, who under the name of *Jacobin*, really does crush and massacre.

Where

Relation  
between  
the So-  
phisters  
and the  
Jacobins.

Where then the difference between the sophistical sect under Voltaire and D'Alembert, anticipating the murders of the French revolution, by their wishes and their conspiracies, and those sophisters, who under the name of Jacobin, overthrow the altar and embroe its steps with the blood of its priests and pontifs? Do not they proscribe the religion of the same Christ, of the same God, whom Voltaire, D'Alembert, Frederick and all that impious sequel of adepts had sworn to crush and abhor? Will any one tell us, that there is any difference between the sophisms of the former, and the pretexts of the latter, between the school of Voltaire and the maxims of the Jacobinical den.

The Jacobins will one day declare that all men are free, that all men are equal, and as a consequence of this liberty and equality they will conclude that every man must be left to the lights of reason. That every religion subjecting man's reason to mysteries, or to the authorities of any revelation speaking in God's name, is a religion of slavery and constraint; that as such it should be annihilated, in order to re-establish the indefeasible rights of liberty and equality, as to the belief or disbelief of all that the reason of man approves or disapproves: and they will call this liberty and equality, the reign of reason and the empire of philo-

philosophy. Can the candid reader believe, that this liberty and equality is not apposite to the war carried on by Voltaire against Christianity? Had the chiefs or adepts ever any other view, than that of establishing their pretended empire of philosophy or their reign of reason, on that self-same liberty and equality applied to revelation and the mysteries, in perpetual opposition to Christ and his church?

Did not Voltaire hate the church and its pastors, because they opposed that liberty and equality applied to our belief; because nothing was *so contemptible* and *so miserable* in his eyes, as to see one man have recourse to another in matters of faith, *or to ask what he ought to believe* \*. *Reason, liberty and philosophy* were as constantly in the mouths of Voltaire and D'Alembert, as a means of overthrowing Revelation and the Gospel; as they are at this day in the mouths of the Jacobins †. When the adepts wish to extol the glory of their chiefs, they will represent them *perpetually reclaiming the independence of Reason*, and devoutly expecting those days when *the sun shall no longer shine, but upon free men, acknowledging no other master but their own reason* ‡.

When therefore, on the ruins of the temple, the Jacobins shall have erected the idol of their

\* Letter to the Duke D'Uzez, 19th Nov. 1760.

† See the whole of their correspondence.

‡ Condorcet's Progress of Reason, 9th Epoch.

reason, their liberty or their philosophy; will they have fulfilled any other wish, any other oath, than that sworn by Voltaire and his adepts.

When the Jacobins shall apply the axe to the foundations of the temples whether Protestant or Catholic, or in fine of any sect acknowledging the God of the Christians; will they have more widely extended their systems of destruction, than Voltaire conspiring against the altars of London or Geneva, equally as against those of Rome?

When their grand club shall be filled with every infidel the French revolution can produce, whether Atheist, Deist or Sceptic, will their revolutionary cohorts be differently formed, than those which D'Alembert was to quicken and stir up against the God of Christianity?

In fine, when one day these legions falling from this den of impiety, from the grand club of the Jacobins, shall triumphantly carry to the Pantheon, the ashes of Voltaire; will not that be the consummating of the Antichristian Conspiracy, will not that be the revolution so long planned by Voltaire? The means may differ, but the object, the spirit, and the extent of the conspiracy will remain. We shall see the very means employed, the revolution that destroys the altar, that plunders and massacres its priests by the hand of the Jacobin, were not foreign to the wishes or intentions of the first adepts. The most dreadful and disgusting parts  
of

of this irreligious revolution, only differs from their plans, by a difference in terms; *one* WISHED *to crush, the other* DID *crush*. The means were such as the times suggested, both were not equally powerful.—We will now proceed to tear the veil from those dark intrigues, successively employed by the Sophisters during the half century, which prepared such scenes of blood and confusion.

---

## CHAP. IV.

*First Means of the Conspirators.*

IN order to *crush the wretch*, in the sense of Voltaire, or to attain the destruction of the altars of that God whose worship had been taught by the Apostles, nothing less could suffice than the total subjection of the public opinion, and the annihilation of the faith of all Christian nations. To annihilate it by force was above the strength of the rising coalition. Force was only to be resorted to, when by a revolution in all religious ideas, things had been brought to that state, in which our Jacobin legislators found them; or when, by incredulity, the courts the senates the armies, in fine, men of all descriptions, had been gained over to a submission, or blind confidence in their sophistry. And indeed the necessary growth of impiety and corruption, supposed too long a period, for Frederick or Voltaire ever to flatter themselves with the hopes of seeing it\*. It was then too early for them to grasp the falchion of the butchering Jacobin; nor must we expect, in the following pages, to read of guillo-

\* Letter of Frederick to Voltaire, 5th May 1767.

tines,



tines, or forced requisitions in battle array, against the altars of Christianity.

In the beginning we see their intrigues hidden, and without tumult; slow and tortuous, but more insidious from their secrecy, more certain from their slowness; the public opinion was to perish, as it were, by inanition, before they dared lay the axe to the altar. And this mode of proceeding we find, is perfectly understood by Frederick, when he writes to Voltaire, that *to undermine the edifice in silence, is to oblige it to fall of itself*\*; and still better understood by D'Alembert, when upbraiding Voltaire with being too hasty, he says, *If mankind grows enlightened, it is because we have the care to enlighten them by degrees*†. Convinced of the necessity of this gradation, D'Alembert bethought himself of the Encyclopedia, as the grand means of philosophizing mankind, and *crushing the wretch*. His project is no sooner conceived, than enthusiastically embraced by Diderot; and Voltaire animated their drooping courage more than once, by his constant attention to the undertaking.

To judge of what amazing importance the success of this famous dictionary was to the conspiring chiefs, we must be acquainted with the plan, the method of its execution, and how it was

Its supposed object.

\* 29th July 1775.

† 31st July 1762.

to become the infallible agent of incredulity, and its most powerful weapon in perverting the public opinion, or overturning all the principles of Christianity.

The Encyclopedia is at first ushered into the world as the aggregate, as the complete treasure of all human arts and sciences, of Religion, Divinity, Physics, History, Geography, Astronomy or Commerce; in a word, of whatever may constitute a Science: of Poetry, Oratory, Grammar, Painting, Architecture, Manufactures, or of whatever can be the object of useful or pleasing arts. This great work was to comprehend the very minutiae of different trades, from the manufacturer to the labourer; it was of itself to be an immense library, and supply the place of one. It was to be the work of men the most scientific and the most profound in every branch, that France could produce. The discourse in which it was announced by D'Alembert to all Europe, was written with so much art, had been so profoundly meditated and nicely weighed, the concatenation of the sciences and the progress of the human mind, appeared so properly delineated; whatever he had borrowed from Bacon or Chambers on the filiation of ideas, so perfectly disguised; in fine, the plagiarist sophist had so perfectly decked himself in the riches of others, that the prospectus of the Encyclopedia was looked upon

as

as a masterpiece, and its author as the most proper person to preside over so stupendous a work.

Such were their mighty promises, but promises never intended to be fulfilled; while, on the other side, they had their secret object, and that they were determined to accomplish. This was to convert the Encyclopedia into a vast emporium of all the sophisms, errors or calumnies, which ever had been invented against religion, from the first schools of impiety, until the day of their enterprise; and these were to be so artfully concealed, that the reader should insensibly imbibe the poison without the least suspicion. To prevent discovery the error was never to be found where it might be supposed, religion was not only to be respected, but even supported in all direct discussions, though sometimes the discussion is so handled, that the objection they seem to refute, is more forcibly impressed on the mind of the reader. The more to impose on the unthinking, D'Alembert and Diderot artfully engaged several men of unblemished character to partake in this vast undertaking. Such was Mr. de Jeaucourt, a man of great learning and probity, who has furnished a number of articles to the Encyclopedia: his name alone could have been thought a sufficient guarantee against all the art and perfidy of its principles; in short, it was declared that all points of religion were to be

Its secret  
object.

discussed by divines, well known for their learning and orthodoxy.

All this might have been true, and the work only prove the more perfidious, D'Alembert and Diderot reserving to themselves a three-fold resource to forward their Antichristian Conspiracy.

Its means  
and art.

Their first resource, was that of insinuating error and infidelity into those articles deemed the least susceptible of them ; such, for example, as History, or Natural Philosophy, even into Chemistry and Geography, where such danger could not even have been surmised. The second was that of references, an art so precious, by which after having placed some religious truths under the reader's eye, he is tempted to seek further information in articles of a quite different cast. Sometimes the mere reference was an epigram or a sarcasm. They would, after having treated a religious subject with all possible respect, simply add, *See the art.* PREJUDICE, or SUPERSTITION, or FANATICISM; lastly, when our referring Sophisters feared this shift could not avail them, they would not hesitate at falsifying and altering the discussion of a virtuous co-operator, or at adding an article of their own, whose apparent object was to defend, while the real was to refute what had already been written on the subject. In fine, impiety was to be sufficiently veiled  
to

to make it attractive, while it left place for excuse and subterfuge. This was the peculiar art of our barking sophister D'Alembert. Diderot, more daring, was at first countenanced in the mad flights of his impiety, but in cooler moments, his articles were to be revised ; he was then to add some apparent restriction in favour of religion, some of those high-sounding and reverential words, but which left the whole of the impiety to subsist. If he was above that care, D'Alembert as supervisor-general, took it upon himself.

Peculiar care was to be taken in the <sup>compiling</sup> ~~reduction~~ of the first volumes, lest the clergy or those men of prejudice, as they were called, should take the alarm. As they proceeded in the work they were to grow more bold, and if circumstances did not favor them, nor allow them to say all they wished to say, they were to resort to supplements, and to foreign editions, which would at the same time render this dangerous work more common, and less costly to the generality of readers.

The Encyclopedia, perpetually recommended and cried up by the adepts, was to be a standing book in all libraries, and insensibly the learned was to be converted into the Antichristian world. If the project was well conceived, it was impossible to see one more faithfully executed.

It is now our duty to lay before the reader, <sup>Proofs.</sup> proofs first as to the fact, secondly as to the intention.

As to the fact. tion. For the first, it will be sufficient to cast the eye on divers articles of this immense collection, especially where the principal tenets of Christianity, or even of natural religion are treated, and to follow them through the divers references the Sophisters have prepared for the reader. We shall find the existence of God, free agency, the spirituality of the soul, treated in the style of a Christian philosopher, but a *vide* DEMONSTRATION, or a *vide* CORRUPTION will be added, to pervert all that had been said; and those articles to which D'Alembert and Diderot more particularly refer the reader, are exactly those, where the doctrine of the sceptic or the Spinofist, of the Fatalist or the Materialist, is chiefly inculcated. [See note at the end of the Chapter.]

This cunning could not escape those authors who wrote in the defence of religion \*. But Voltaire resorting to calumny, in order to defend their Encyclopedia, will represent these authors as enemies of the state, as bad citizens †. Such, indeed, were his usual weapons, and had he perfectly succeeded in deceiving people, it would have been sufficient to have examined his confidential correspondence with the very authors of the work, to be convinced of the wickedness of their intentions.

\* See *Religion Vindicated*, the writings of Gauchat, of Bergier, in our Helvian Letters.

† 18th Letter to D'Alembert.

At

At a hundred leagues from Paris, and not thwarted by the obstacles D'Alembert had to combat, he often complains, that the attacks are not sufficiently direct. He is often ruffled by certain restrictions familiar to D'Alembert, and at length he breaks out on those put to the article *BAYLE*. D'Alembert answers, " This is an idle quarrel indeed, on Bayle's Dictionary. In the first place, I did not say, *happy would it have been had he shown more reverence to religion and morality*. My phrase is much more modest : and besides, in a cursed country like this, where we are writing, who does not know that such sentences are of mere form and only a cloak to the truths additionally conveyed. Every one is aware of that \*."

During the time that Voltaire was so much busied with the articles he so frequently sent to D'Alembert for the *Encyclopedia*, he often complains of his shackles, and is unable to dissemble how much he desires to attack religion openly, and writes, " All that I am told about the articles of Divinity and Metaphysics, grieves me to the heart ; *oh how cruel it is to print the very reverse of what one thinks* †." But D'Alembert, more adroit, sensible of the necessity of these palliatives, *lest he should be looked upon as a madman by those he wished to convert,*" foresaw the day when he

\* 10th Oct. 1764.

† Let. of the 9th of Oct. 1755.  
could

could triumphantly answer, " If mankind is so much enlightened to-day, it is only because we have had the precaution, or good fortune, to enlighten them by degrees \*."

When Voltaire had sent certain violent articles, under the name of the priest of Lausanne, D'Alembert would immediately write, " We shall always receive with gratitude whatever comes from the same hand. We only pray our heretic to draw in his claw a little, as in certain places he has shown his fangs a little too much. *This is the time for stepping back to make the better leap †.*" And to show that he never lost sight of this maxim, he answers Voltaire's animadversions on the article HELL: "Without doubt we have several wretched articles in our divinity and metaphysics, *but with divines for censors and a privilege, I defy you to make them better.* There are articles less exposed where all is set to rights again †."

Can there be a doubt left of the precise and determined intention of the Encyclopedists, when Voltaire exhorts D'Alembert to snatch the moment, whilst the attention of government is drawn off by other concerns. " During this war with the parliament and the bishops, the philosophers will have fine play. You have a fair opportunity of filling the Encyclopedia with those truths, that

\* 16th July 1762.

† 21st July 1757.

‡ Ibid.

" we



" *we should not have dared utter twenty years ago* \*."

Or when he writes to Damilaville, "I can be concerned for a good dramatic performance, but " could be far more pleased with a good philosophical work that should for ever crush the " wretch. *I place all my hopes in the Encyclopedia* †." After such an avowal it would be useless to seek further proof, of this immense compilation being no other than the grand arsenal for all their sophisticated arms against religion.

Diderot more open, even in his ambushes reluctantly employed cunning. He does not hide how much he wished, boldly to insert his principles, and his principles are explained when he writes, "The age " of Louis XIV. only produced two men worthy " of co-operating to the Encyclopedia," and these two men were Perault and Boindin. The merits of the latter are more conspicuous than those of the former. Boindin, born in 1676, had lately died a reputed Atheist, and had been refused Christian burial. The notoriety of his principles had shut the French academy against him, and with such titles he could not have failed being a worthy co-operator.

Such then the object, such the intention of the conspiring authors. We see by their own confession, that they did not wish to compile for

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 13th Nov. 1756.

† 23d May 1764.

science,

science, but to compile for incredulity; that it was not the advancement of arts they sought, but to seize the moment, when the attention of the ruling authorities were drawn off, to propagate their impious calumnies against religion. They hypocritically utter some few religious truths; they *print the contrary of what they believed* on Christianity, but only the better to cover the sophisms they printed against it.

Obstacles  
and suc-  
cess of the  
Encyclo-  
pedia.

In spite of all those arts, men zealous for religion, forcibly opposed the work. The Dauphin in particular, obtained a temporary suspension of it; and various were the rebuffs the authors met with. D'Alembert wearied, had nearly forsaken it, when Voltaire, sensible of the importance of this first tool of the conspiracy, roused his drooping courage. He, far from abating, rather redoubled his efforts, asking for, and incessantly sending fresh articles. He would extol perseverance, he would show D'Alembert and Diderot the ignominy and shame redounding to their opponents\*. He would urge them, conjure them by their friendship or in the name of philosophy to overcome their disgust, and not to be foiled in so glorious an undertaking†.

At length the Encyclopedia was brought to a conclusion, and it made its appearance under the

\* See his letters of the years 1755-6.

† Letters of 5th Sept. 1752, 13th Nov. 1756, and particularly of 8th Jan. 1757.

sanction

sanction of a public privilege. Triumphant in their first step, the conspirators saw in it but the forerunner of their future successes against religion.

Lest any one should doubt of the particular drift of this compilation ; the reader must be informed of the co-operators chosen by D'Alembert and Diderot, and that especially for the religious part. Their first divine was Raynal, a man just expelled from the order of the Jesuits on account of his impiety, his chief and strongest recommendation to D'Alembert. Every one unfortunately knows how much he verified the judgement of his former brethren, by his atrocious declamations against Christianity ; but few are acquainted with the anecdote of his expulsion from among the co-operators, and that connects his story with that of another divine, who, without being impious himself, had been unfortunately drawn into the company of the Sophisters.

This was the Abbé Yvon, an odd metaphysician, but an inoffensive and upright man ; often in extreme indigence, and living by his pen, when he thought he could do it with decency. In the simplicity of his heart he had written *The Defence of the Abbé de Prades*. I have heard him assert that not a single error could be found in that work, and on the first argument give up the point. With the same simplicity I have heard him relate, by  
what

what means he had co-operated to the Encyclopædia.  
 “ I was in want of money, (said he); Raynal  
 “ met me and persuaded me to write a few articles,  
 “ promising me a good reward, I acceded, and  
 “ my work delivered at Raynal’s study, I received  
 “ twenty-five Louis-d’ors. Thinking myself very  
 “ well paid, I imparted my good fortune to one  
 “ of the booksellers employed for the Encyclopæ-  
 “ dia, who seemed much surprised that the arti-  
 “ cles furnished by Raynal, should not be his own.  
 “ He was furious at the trick he surmised. A few  
 “ days after I was sent for to the office; and Ray-  
 “ nal, who had received a thousand crowns for his  
 “ pretended work, was obliged to refund me the  
 “ hundred Louis-d’ors he had kept for himself.”

This anecdote will not surprise those who are acquainted with Raynal’s plagiarist talents. His impiety was not sufficient to prevent his dismissal, but it preserved him within the pale of the fraternal embrace.

I must add, that the articles on GOD and on the SOUL, furnished by the Abbé Yvon, are exactly those which grieved Voltaire to the heart, and for which, D’Alembert and Diderot were obliged to have recourse to their art of references.

The third divine, or as D’Alembert styles him the second, for he never dared mention Yvon to Voltaire, was the Abbé de Prades, obliged to fly to Prussia, on his attempt to impose on the Sorbonne

Sorbonne in advancing his own impious propositions for those of religion. It was the cunning of this thesis which had misled the Abbé Yvon, but soon discovered, the parliament took it up. The author, nevertheless, was put under the protection of the King of Prussia, by Voltaire and D'Alembert \*.

We also owe to the memory of De Prades to repeat, what his protectors would willingly conceal; that three years after, he publicly retracted all his errors in a declaration signed the 6th of April 1754, bewailing his intimacy with the Sophisters, adding, *that one life could not suffice to weep his past conduct* † : he died in 1782.

Another of their divines was the Abbé Morelet, a man precious to Voltaire and D'Alembert, who playing on his name called him the Abbé *Mord-les* (bite them), because under pretence of attacking the Inquisition, he had fallen on (bitten) the church with all his might ‡.

Should we enumerate the lay writers who co-operated in this work, we should find far worse. But we will only mention the famous Dumarçais, at the same time so infamous, that the public autho-

\* Correspondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, let. 2 and 3.

† Feller's Hist. Dict.

‡ Correspondence of D'Alembert, No. 65 and 96 : Let. to Thiriot, 26th Jan. 1762.

rities were obliged to interfere and destroy a school he had formed, solely to imbibe his pupils with the venom of his impiety. This unfortunate man also retracted his errors, but only on his death-bed. The choice of this man's pen, shows what co-operators D'Alembert sought.

Far be it from me, to confound, in this class, such men as M. de Formey or Jaucourt, particularly the latter, to whom, as we have already said, they were indebted for many articles. The only reproach we can make him, is that he should have continued his labours, after he either did or should have seen the drift of that vast compilation, where intermixed with his toils, lay all the sophisms and calumnies impiety could invent.

Excepting these two men, we may nearly comprehend the rest of the Encyclopedian writers, in the following picture, drawn by Diderot himself.

“ All that detestable crew, who, though perfectly  
 “ ignorant, valued themselves on knowing every  
 “ thing, who seeking to distinguish themselves by  
 “ that vexatious universality they pretended to,  
 “ fell upon every thing, jumbled and spoiled all,  
 “ and converted this pretended digest of science  
 “ *into a gulph, or rather a sort of rag-basket, where*  
 “ *they promiscuously threw every thing half examined,*  
 “ *ill digested, good, bad, and indifferent, but al-*  
 “ *ways incoherent.*” What a precious avowal as  
 to the intrinsic merit of their work; especially  
 after

after what he says as to their views, in describing the pains they had taken, the torments it had put them to, the art it had required to insinuate what they dared not openly write against prejudices (religion), in order to overthrow them without being perceived\*.

In fine, all these follies of the *rag-dealers*, contributed to the bulk and accelerated the appearance of the volumes; the chiefs carefully inserting, in each volume, what could promote the grand object. At length terminated, all the trumpets sounded, and the journals of the party teemed with the praises of this literary achievement. The learned themselves were duped. Every one would have an Encyclopedia. Numerous were the editions, of all sizes and prices, but under the pretence of correcting, greater boldness was assumed. About the time, when the antichristian revolution was nearly accomplished, appeared *The Encyclopedia by order of Matter*. A new-Encyclopedia. When it was first undertaken, some deference was still paid to religion. A man of eminent merit, Mr. Bergier, a canon of Paris, thought it incumbent on him to yield to the pressing solicitations of his friends, lest the part treating of religion, should fall into the hands of its greatest enemies. What was easy to foresee came to pass.

\* The text in the original is far more extensive, where Diderot treats of the deficiencies of the Encyclopedia, but not having it at hand, we quote from Feller's Hist. Dict. art. DIDEROT.

The name of a man, who had combated the impious works of a Voltaire or a Rousseau, naturally served as a cloak to this new digest, styled *The Encyclopedia methodised*. This was on the eve of the French revolution, so that the petty infidels charged with the work, kept no further bounds with regard to religion. This new work is more completely impious than the former, notwithstanding some excellent tracts of Mr. Bergier and of some others; and thus the Sophisters of the day perfected the first tool of the Antichristian conspirators.

---

*Note referred to in Page 58.*

Devices  
of the  
Encyclo-  
pedia on  
the ar-  
ticle  
God.

Look for the article GOD (Geneva edition) and you will find very sound notions, together with the direct, physical and metaphysical demonstration of his existence; and indeed under such an article it would have been too manifest to have broached any thing even bordering on Atheism, Spinozism, or Epicurism; but the reader is *referred* to the article DEMONSTRATION, and there all the physical and metaphysical cogent arguments for the existence of a God disappear. We are there taught, that all direct demonstrations *suppose the idea of infinitude, and that such an idea cannot be of the clearest, either for the Naturalist or the Metaphysician.* This in a word destroys all confidence the reader had in the proofs adduced of the existence of God. There again, they are pleased to tell you, that a single insect, in the eyes of the philosopher, more forcibly proves *the existence of a God, than all the metaphysical arguments whatever* (ibid.); but you are then *referred* to CORRUPTION, where you learn how much you are to beware of asserting in a positive manner, that corruption can  
never



never beget animated bodies, and that such a production of animated bodies by corruption, seems to be countenanced by *daily experiments*; and it is from these experiments precisely, that the Atheists conclude, that the existence of God is unnecessary, either for the creation of man or animals. Prepossessed by these *references*, against the existence of God, let the reader turn to the articles of ENCYCLOPEDIA and EPICURISM. In the former he will be told, *that there is no being in nature that can be called the first or last, and that a machine infinite in every way must necessarily be the Deity*. In the latter the *atom* is to be the Deity. It will be the primary cause of all things, by whom and of whom, every thing is, active, essentially of itself, *alone unalterable, alone eternal, alone immutable*; and thus the reader will be insensibly led from the God of the Gospel to the heathenish fictions of an Epicurus or of a Spinoza.

The same cunning is to be found in the article of the SOUL. When the Sophisters treat directly of its essence they give the ordinary proofs of its *spirituality and of its immortality*. They will even add in the article BRUTE, that the soul cannot be supposed *material*, nor can the brute be reduced to the quality of a mere machine, without running the hazard of making of man an Automaton. And under NATURAL LAW we read, that if the determinations of man, or even his oscillations, arise from any thing *material, extraneous to his soul*, there will be neither good nor evil, neither just nor unjust, neither obligation nor right. Then referred to the article LOCKE, in order to do away all this consequence, we are told that it is of no importance *whether matter thinks or not, for what is that to justice or injustice, to the immortality of the soul and to all the truths of the system, whether political or religious*; the reader, enjoying the liberty and equality of his reason, is left in doubt with regard to the spirituality, and no longer knows whether he should not think himself all matter. But he will decide when, under the article ANIMAL, he finds

On the  
article  
of the  
SOUL.

*that life and animation are only physical properties of matter, and lest he should think himself debased by his resembling a plant or an animal, to console him in his fall, they will tell him, article ENCYCLOPÆDIA and ANIMAL, that the only difference between certain vegetables, and animals such as us, is, that they sleep and that we wake, that we are animals that feel, and that they are animals that feel not; and still further in the article ANIMAL, that the sole difference between a flock and a man, is, that the one ever falls, while the latter never falls after the same manner. After perusing these articles bona fide, the reader must be insensibly drawn into the vortex of materialism.*

On the  
article  
LIBER-  
TY.

In treating of Liberty or free agency, we find the same artifice. When they treat of it directly, they will say, "Take away liberty, all human nature is overthrown, and there will be no trace of order in society—Recompense will be ridiculous, and chastisement unjust.—The ruin of liberty carries with it, that of all order, of police, and legitimates the most monstrous crimes—So monstrous a doctrine is not to be debated in the schools, but punished by the magistrates, &c. *Ob, Liberty!* they exclaim, *Ob, Liberty, gift of heaven! Ob, Liberty of action! Ob, Liberty of thought!* thou alone art capable of great things." [See articles AUTHORITY and the PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE.] But at the article CHANCE (*fortuit*) all this liberty of action and of thought is only a power that cannot be exercised, that cannot be known by actual exercise; and Diderot at the article EVIDENCE pretending to support liberty will very properly say, "This concatenation of causes and effects supposed by the philosophers, in order to form ideas representing the mechanism of the Universe, is as fabulous as the Tritons and the Naiads." But both him and D'Alembert will descant again on that concatenation, and returning to CHANCE (*fortuit*), will tell us "That though it is imperceptible, it is not the less real; that it connects all things  
" in

“ in nature, that *all events depend on it*; just as the wheels of  
 “ the watch, as to their motion, depend on each other: that  
 “ from the first moment of our existence, we are by *no means*  
 “ *masters of our motions*; that were there a thousand worlds  
 “ similar to this, and simultaneously existing, governed by  
 “ the same laws, every thing in them would be done in the  
 “ same way; and that *man in virtue of these same laws, would*  
 “ *perform at the same instants of time, the same actions*, in each  
 “ one of these worlds.” This will naturally convince, the  
 uninformed reader, of the chimera of such a liberty or free  
 agency, which cannot be exercised. Not content with this,  
 Diderot at the article FATALITY, after a long dissertation  
 on this *concatenation of causes*, ends by saying, that it *cannot*  
*be contested either in the physical world, nor in the moral and*  
*intellectual world*. Hence what becomes of that liberty without  
 which there no longer exists *just or unjust, obligation or right*.

These examples will suffice to convince the reader of the  
 truth of what we have asserted, as to the artful policy with  
 which the Encyclopedia had been digested; they will show  
 with what cunning its authors sought to spread the principles  
 of Atheism, Materialism and Fatalism, in fine, every error  
 incompatible with that religion, for which they professed so  
 great a reverence at their outset.

---

## CHAP. V.

*Second means of the Conspirators.—The Extinction of the Jesuits.*

THE hypocrisy of Voltaire and D'Alembert, had triumphed over every obstacle. They had so perfectly succeeded in their abuse on every person who dared oppose the Encyclopedia, representing them as barbarians and enemies to literature; they had found such powerful support during the successive ministries of D'Argenson, Choiseul and Malesherbes, that all the opposition of the great Dauphin, of the clergy and of the religious writers, could not avail, and this impious digest was in future to be looked upon as a necessary work. It was to be found in every library, whether at home or abroad, it was always to be referred to. From thence the simple mind in quest of science, was to imbibe the poison of incredulity, and the Sophister was to be furnished with arms against Christianity. The conspirators, though proud of their first invention, could not dissemble, that there existed a set of men whose zeal, whose learning, whose weight and authority, might one day counteract their undertaking. The church was

General  
with of  
the con-  
spirators  
as to reli-  
gious or-  
ders.

was defended by her bishops and all the lower clergy. They had, moreover, numerous orders of religious, always ready to join the seculars for her defence in the cause of Christianity. But before we treat of the means employed for the destruction of these defenders of the faith, we must show the plan formed by Frederick, whence they resolved on the destruction of the Jesuits, as the first step towards dismantling the church, the destruction of her bishops and of her different orders of priesthood.

In the year 1743, Voltaire had been sent on secret service to the court of Prussia and among his dispatches from Berlin, we find the following written to the minister Amelot. “ In the last interview I had with his Prussian majesty, I spoke to him of a pamphlet that appeared in Holland about six weeks back, in which the secularization of ecclesiastical principalities in favour of the Emperor and Queen of Hungary, was proposed as the means of pacification for the Empire. I told him that I could wish, with all my heart, to see it take place; that what was Cæsar’s was to be given to Cæsar; that the whole business of the church was to supplicate God and the princes; that by his institution, the Benedictine would have no claim to sovereignty, and that this decided opinion of mine, had gained me many enemies among the clergy. He owned  
“ that

Frederick's first plan to overthrow the church.

“ that the *pamphlet had been printed by his orders.*  
 “ He hinted that he should not dislike to be one  
 “ of those kings, to whom the clergy would con-  
 “ scientiously make restitution, and that he should  
 “ not be sorry to embellish Berlin with the goods  
 “ of the church. This is most certainly his grand  
 “ object, and he means only to make peace, when  
 “ he sees the possibility of accomplishing it. It  
 “ is in your breast, to prudently profit of this his  
 “ secret plans, which he confided to me alone \*.”

Effect of  
this plan  
at the  
court of  
Versailles

It was at this period that the court of Lewis XV. began to be overrun with ministers, who thought on religious matters, like a Voltaire or a Frederick. They had no ecclesiastical states, no ecclesiastical electors to pillage, but the possessions of the numerous religious orders dispersed through France, could satiate their rapacity, and they conceived that the plan of Frederick, could be equally lucrative to France. The Marquis D'Argenson, counsellor of state and minister of foreign affairs, was the great patron of Voltaire.

D'Argen-  
son's plan.

It was he who adopted all his ideas, and formed the plan for the destruction of all religious orders in France. The progress of the plan was to be slow and successive, lest it should spread the alarm. They were to begin with those orders that were least numerous, they were to render the entrance into religion more difficult, and the time of their

• General correspondence, 8th Oct. 1743.

pro-

professions was to be delayed until that age, when people are already engaged in some other state of life. The possessions of the suppressed <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ artfully to be adapted to some pious use, or united to the episcopal revenues. Time was to do away all difficulties, and the day was not far off, when, as lord paramount, the sovereign was to put in his claim to all that belonged to the suppressed orders, even to what had been united, for the moment, to the sees of the bishops; the whole was to be added to his domains.

That the French ministry often changed, but that the plans of the cabinet never did; and that it always watched the favorable opportunity, was the remark of a shrewd and observing legate. The plan, for the destruction of religious orders, had been made by D'Argenson, in the year 1745, though forty years after it lay on the chimney-piece of Maurepas, then prime minister. I owe this anecdote to a person of the name of Bevis\*, a learned Benedictine, and in such high repute with Maurepas, that he often pressed him to leave his hood, promising him preferment as a secular. The Benedictine refused such offers, and it was not without surprise, that he heard Maurepas tell him, in pressing him to accept his offer, *that secularization would one day be his lot*; he then gave him D'Argenson's plan, which had long been followed and would soon be accomplished.

\* He is at present in London.

Avarice alone could not have suggested this plan, as the mendicant orders, as well as the more wealthy, were equally to be destroyed.

It would have been nugatory to attempt the execution before the Encyclopedian sophisters had prepared the way; it was therefore dormant many years in the state offices at Versailles. In the mean time the Voltarian ministry, fostering up infidelity, pretended to strike, while they secretly supported the sophistical tribe. They forbid Voltaire the entrance of Paris, while *in amazement he receives a scroll of the king*, confirming his pension, *which had been suppressed twelve years before* \* ! He carries on his correspondence with the adepts, under the covers and the very seal of the first secretaries and of the ministers themselves, who were perfectly conversant with all his impious plans †. It was this very part of the Antichristian Conspiracy that Condorcet was wont to describe when he says: “Often a government would reward the philosopher with one hand, whilst  
“ with the other it would pay his slanderer;  
“ would proscribe him, while they were proud of  
“ the soil that had given him birth; punished  
“ him for his opinions, but would have blushed  
“ not to have partaken of them ‡.”

\* Let. to Damilaville, 9th Jan. 1762.

† Let. to Marmontel, 13th Aug. 1760.

‡ Condorcet's Sketch on History, 9th Epoch.

This



This perfidious understanding between the ministers of his most Christian Majesty, and the Antichristian Conspirators, hastened their progress, when the most impious and most despotic of ministers, judged that the time was come when the decisive blow could be struck. This minister was the Duke of Choiseul; during the whole time of his power he was the faithful adept and admirer of Voltaire, who says: "Don't fear opposition from the Duke of Choiseul; I repeat it, I don't mislead you, he will be proud of serving you \*:" or to Marmontel, "We have been a little alarmed by certain panics, but never was fright so unfounded. The Duke de Choiseul and Mad. de Pompadour know the opinions of the *uncle* and of the *niece*. You may send any thing without danger." In fine, he was so secure in the duke's protection against the Sorbonne and the church, that he would exclaim, "*The ministry of France for ever; long live the Duke de Choiseul †.*"

Choiseul's understanding with the Sophists.

This confidence of the premier chief was well placed in Choiseul, who had adopted and taken up all the plans of D'Argenson. The ministry prosecuted a great source of riches to the state, in the destruction of the religious, though many of them did not seek in that, the destruction of religion; they even thought some of them necessary

Resolves the destruction of the Jesuits: why he begins with them.

\* Let. to D'Alembert, No. 68, anno 1760.

† Let. to Marmontel, 13th Aug. 1760, and 2d Sept. 1767.

and

larly divines, who immediately combated any error, that might spring up in the church. Latterly they were chiefly engaged in France against the Jansenists and Sophisters, and it was their zeal in the defence of the church, that made the King of Prussia style them the *The Life-guards of the Pope* \*.

Opinion  
of the  
bishops  
on the  
Jesuits.

When fifty French prelates, cardinals, archbishops or bishops, assembled, were consulted by Louis XV. on the propriety of destroying the order, they expressly answered: “ The Jesuits  
“ are of infinite service to us in our dioceses,  
“ whether for preaching or the direction of the  
“ faithful, to revive, preserve and propagate faith  
“ and piety, by their missions, congregations and  
“ spiritual retreats, which they make with our ap-  
“ probation, and under our authority. For these  
“ reasons we think, Sire, that to prohibit them  
“ from instructing, would essentially injure our  
“ dioceses, and that it would be difficult to re-  
“ place them with equal advantage in the instruc-  
“ tion of youth, and more particularly so, in those  
“ provincial towns where there are no universi-  
“ ties †.”

Such in general was the idea entertained of them in all Catholic countries ; it is essential to the reader to be acquainted with it, that he <sup>may</sup> ~~might~~ under-

\* Let. of the King of Prussia to Voltaire, No. 154, anno 1767.  
† Opinion of the Bishops, 1761.

stand

stand of what importance their destruction was to the Sophisters. At the time, the Jansenists had the honor of it, and indeed they were very ardent in the success. But the Duke de Choiseul, and the famous courtesan La Marquise de Pompadour, who then held the destiny of France, under the shadow and in the name of Louis XV, were not more partial to the Jansenists than to the Jesuits. Both confidants of Voltaire, they were consequently initiated in all the mysteries of the Sophisters\*, and Voltaire, as he says himself, *would willingly have seen all the Jesuits at the bottom of the sea, each with a Jansenist bung to his neck*†.

The Jansenists were nothing more than the hounds employed in the general hunt by Choiseul, the Marquise de Pompadour and the Sophisters. The Minister, spurred on by his impiety, the marquise, wishing to revenge the insult, as she called it, received from Pere Sacy a Jesuit. This father had refused her the sacraments, unless by quitting the court, she would in some sort atone for the public scandal she had given, by her cohabitation with Louis XV. But if we judge by Voltaire's letters, they neither of them needed much stimulation, as they both had always been great protectors of the Sophisters, and the mini-

\* Let. of Voltaire to Marmontel, 13th Aug. 1760.

† Let. to Chabanon.

D'Alembert's  
avowal  
on their  
destruction.

fter had always favored their intrigues as far as he could, consistently with circumstances and politics\*. The following pages will show these intrigues, and we shall begin by D'Alembert, who writes in the most sanguine manner on their future victory over the Jesuits, and on the immense advantages to be derived to the conspiracy by their downfall. "You are perpetually repeating, "*Crush the wretch*; for God's sake let it fall headlong of itself! Do you know what Astruc says? "It is not the Jansenists that are killing the Jesuits, but the Encyclopedia. Yes, zounds! it is the Encyclopedia, and that is not unlikely. "This scoundrel of an Astruc is a second Pasquin, "he sometimes says good things. For my part I "see every thing in the brightest colours: I foresee the Jansenists naturally dying off the next year, after having strangled the Jesuits this; "toleration established, the Protestants recalled, "the priests married, confession abolished, and "*fanaticism* (religion) *crushed*, and all this without "its even being perceived †."

The very words of the conspirators show what part they had in the destruction of the Jesuits. They were the true cause; we see what advantage they hoped to reap from it; they had kindled the hatred, they had procured the death warrant. The

\* Let. from Voltaire to Marmontel, 21 Aug. 1767.

† Let. 100.

Jansenists

Jansenists were to serve the conspirators, but fall themselves, when no more wanted. The Calvinists were to be recalled, but only to perish in their turn. To strike at the whole Christian religion was their aim, and impiety with its sophisters, was solely to range throughout the unbelieving world.

D'Alembert smiles at the blinded parliaments, seconding with all their power the plans of the conspirators. It is in this idea he writes to Voltaire: "The laugh is no longer on the side of the Jesuits, since they have fallen out with the philosophers; at present they are at open war with the parliament, who find that the society of Jesus is contrary to *human* society. This same society of Jesus finds on its side, that the order of the parliament is not within the order of those who have common sense, and *philosophy would decide that both the society of Jesus and the parliament are in the right* \*." Or again, when he writes to Voltaire: "The evacuation of the college of Louis le Grand (the Jesuits College at Paris) is of more importance to us than that of Martinico. Upon my word this is becoming serious, and the people of the parliament don't mince the matter. They think they are serving religion, while *they are forwarding*

\* Letter 98, 1761.

“ *reason without the least suspicion.* They are  
 “ the public executioners, *who take their orders*  
 “ *from philosophy without knowing it \**.” Wrapped  
 up in his idea, when he sees the Encyclopedian  
 commands nearly executed, he openly avows the  
 cause of his revenge ; he even implores Heaven,  
 lest his prey should escape him. “ Philosophy  
 “ (says he) is on the eve of being revenged of  
 “ the Jesuits, but who will avenge it of the other  
 “ fanatics. Pray God, dear brother, that reason  
 “ may triumph even in our days †.”

And this day of triumph comes, he proclaims  
 the long-concerted exploit : “ At length, he cries,  
 “ on the sixth of next month, we shall be deli-  
 “ vered from all that Jesuitical rabble, but will rea-  
 “ son for that, have gained, or *the wretch* have lost  
 “ ground ‡.”

Thus we see, under this shocking formula, the  
 destruction of Christianity is linked with that of  
 the Jesuits. D'Alembert was so much convinced of  
 the importance of their triumph over that order,  
 that hearing one day of Voltaire's pretended grati-  
 tude to his former masters, he immediately wrote  
 to him, “ Do you know what I was told yester-  
 “ day, that you began to pity the Jesuits, that  
 “ you was almost tempted to write in their favor,  
 “ as if it were possible to interest any one in fa-

\* Let. 100.

† Let. 90, anno 1761.

‡ Let. 102.

“ vor

“ vor of people, on whom you have cast so much  
 “ ridicule. *Believe me, let us have no human weak-*  
*ness.* Let the Jansenitical rabble rid us of the  
 “ Jesuitical, and do not prevent one spider from  
 “ devouring another\*.”

Nothing was less founded than this alarm, Vol- Avowal of Vol-  
 taire was not the writer of the conclusions drawn taire.  
 by the Attorney-Generals of the Parliament, as  
 D’Alembert had been informed, who himself had  
 been the author of Mr. de la Chalotais, the most  
 artful and virulent pièce that appeared against the  
 Jesuits. Voltaire however was not less active in  
 composing and circulating memorials against  
 them †.

If he suspected any great personage of protect-  
 ing the Jesuits, he would write and use his utmost  
 endeavours to dissuade them. It was for that he  
 wrote to the Mareschal de Richelieu, “ I have  
 “ been told, my Lord, that you had favored the  
 “ Jesuits at Bourdeaux. Try to destroy whatever  
 “ influence they may have ‡.” Thus again he did  
 not blush to upbraid Frederick himself, with having  
 offered an asylum to these unfortunate victims of  
 their plots ||. Full as rancorous as D’Alembert,  
 he would express his joy at their misfortunes in the  
 same gross abuse, and his letters show with what

\* Let. 15th of Sept. 1762.

† Let. to the Marquis D’Argence de Dirac, 26th Feb.  
 1762. ‡ Let. of the 27th Nov. 1761. || 5th Nov. 1773.

adepts he shared it. " I rejoice with my brave  
 " *chevalier* (he would write to the Marq. de Vielle-  
 " ville) on the expulsion of the Jesuits ; Japan  
 " led the way in driving out those knaves of Loy-  
 " ola ; China followed the example of Japan, and  
 " France and Spain have imitated the Chinese.  
 " Would to God that all the monks were swept  
 " from the face of the earth, they are no better  
 " than those knaves of Loyola. If the Sorbonne  
 " was suffered to act, it would be worse than the  
 " Jesuits. One is surrounded with monsters : we  
 " embrace our worthy chevalier, and exhort him  
 " to conceal his march from the enemy \*."

What examples does the philosophist of Ferney  
 adduce ! The cruelties of a Taikofama, who, in  
 expelling and crucifying the missionary Jesuits,  
 also murders thousands and thousands of his sub-  
 jects, in order to irradicate Christianity. The  
 Chinese, less violent indeed, but with whom every  
 persecution against the missionaries, has always  
 been followed or preceded by a prohibition to  
 preach the gospel. Can the man build upon such  
 authorities, without forming the same wish ?

It is to be remarked that Voltaire dares not cite  
 the example of Portugal or of its tyrant Car-  
 valho †. The truth is, that with the rest of  
 Europe,

\* 27th April, 1767.

† I have seen well-informed persons, who thought that the  
 persecution in Portugal was not entirely unconnected with  
 the



Europe, he is obliged to confess, that the conduct of this minister in Portugal, with regard to the Father Malagrida and the pretended conspiracy of the Jesuits, *was the summit of ridicule and the excess of horror* \*.

It is also worthy of remark, that the conspiring Sophisters spared no pains to throw the odium of the assassination of Louis XV. on the Jesuits, and more particularly Damilaville, whom Voltaire answers in the following manner: " My brethren, " you may easily perceive that I have not spared " the Jesuits. But posterity would revolt against " me in their favor, were I to accuse them of a " crime of which all Europe and Damien has " cleared them. I should debase myself into the

the conspiracy of the Sophisters. That it was only a first essay of what might be afterwards attempted against the whole body. This might be. The politics and power of Choiseul and the character of Carvalho, could add weight to this opinion. I candidly confess I have no proof of their secret co-operations; and besides, the ferocious wickedness of Carvalho, has been set in so strong a light, he was the murderer and jailor of so many victims declared innocent by the decree of the 8th of April 1771, that it would be useless to seek any other stimulator than his own heart, in that shocking series of cruelties which distinguished his ministry. See *the Memoirs and Anecdotes of the Marq. of Pombal. The Discontents History by the Comte D'Albon.*

\* Voltaire's Age of Louis XV. chap. 33.

“vile echo of the *Jansenists*, were I to speak otherwise \*.”

Notwithstanding the incoherency in their accusations against the Jesuits, D'Alembert, certain of Voltaire's zeal in this warfare, sends him his *pretended history* of these Religious; a work, of whose hypocrisy, his own pen is the best guarantee, when he speaks of it as a means for the grand object. “I recommend this work to your protection (he writes to Voltaire), I really believe it will be of service to the common cause, and that *superstition* notwithstanding the many blows I pretend to make before it, will not fare the better for it. Was I, like you, far from Paris, to give it a sound threshing, I would certainly do it, with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my strength, indeed, as they tell us, we are to love God. But, placed as I am, I must content myself with giving a few fillips, apologizing for the great liberty taken, and I do not think but what I have hit it off pretty well †.”

Could the reader for a moment forget his indignation at the profligacy of the style, would not the hypocrisy, the profound dissimulation, of which these Sophisters speak so lightly, rouse it anew; if, the annals of history should ever be <sup>searched</sup> compelled, it would be in vain to seek a conspi-

\* Let. to Damilaville, 2d March, 1763.

† 3d January, 1765.

racy whose intrigues, whose cunning was of a deeper hue, and that from its own confession.

As to Frederick, during the whole of this warfare, his conduct is so singular, that his words alone can give a proper idea of it. He would call the Jesuits, *The life-guards of the court of Rome, the grenadiers of Religion*; and as such hated them, and triumphed with the rest of the conspirators in their defeat. But he also beheld in them a body of men useful and even necessary to his state; as such he supported them several years after their destruction; was deaf to the repeated solicitations of Voltaire and his motley crew. One could be almost tempted to think he liked them; he openly writes to Voltaire, "I have no reason to complain of Ganganelli, he has left me my dear Jesuits, who are the objects of universal persecution. I will preserve a seed of so precious and uncommon a plant, to furnish those who may wish to cultivate it hereafter\*." He would even enter in a sort of justification, with Voltaire, on his conduct, so opposite to the views of the party. "However much a heretic, and still more an infidel, says he, I have preserved that order after a fashion, and for the following reasons:

"Not one Catholic man of letters is to be found in these regions, except among the

\* 7th July, 1770.

"Jesuits.

“ Jesuits. We had nobody capable of keeping  
 “ schools. We had no Oratorian Fathers, no  
 “ Purists (Piaristes or Fathers of charity-schools);  
 “ there was no alternative, the destruction of  
 “ our schools, or the preservation of the Jesuits.  
 “ It was necessary that the order should subsist to  
 “ furnish professors, where they dropped off; and  
 “ the foundation could suffice for such an expence;  
 “ but it would have been inadequate to the salary  
 “ of laymen professors. Moreover, it was at  
 “ the university of the Jesuits, that the divines  
 “ were taught; who were afterwards to fill the  
 “ rectories. Had the order been suppressed,  
 “ there was an end of the university, and our  
 “ Silesian divines would have been obliged to go  
 “ and finish their studies in Bohemia, which  
 “ would have been contrary to the fundamental  
 “ principles of our government\*.”

Such was the language of Frederick, speaking  
 in his royal character, such were the political  
 reasons he so ably adduced, in support of his oppo-  
 sition to the Sophisters. Alas! I have already said  
 it; in Frederick there were two distinct men,  
 one the great king, and as such, he believes the  
 preservation of the Jesuits necessary; the other  
 the impious Sophister, conspiring with Voltaire,  
 and triumphant in the loss religion had sustained in

• 8th November, 1777.

that

that of the Jesuits. In the latter character we find him freely exulting with the conspirators and felicitating D'Alembert, on this happy omen of the total destruction of Christianity, and in his sarcastic style, writes, "What an unfortunate age for the court of Rome; she is openly attacked in Poland, her life-guards are driven out of France and Portugal, and it appears that they will share the same fate in Spain. The philosophers openly sap the foundations of the apostolic throne; the hieroglyphics of the conjuror are laughed at, and the author of the sect is pelted, toleration is preached, so all is lost. A miracle alone could save the church. She is stricken with a dreadful apoplexy, and you (Voltaire) will have the happiness of burying her, and of writing her epitaph, as you formerly did that of the Sorbonne \*."

When what Frederick had foreseen really came to pass in Spain, he wrote again to Voltaire. "Here is a new victory you have gained in Spain. The Jesuits are driven out of the kingdom. Moreover the courts of Versailles, of Vienna and Madrid have applied to the Pope for the suppression of divers convents. It is said the holy father, though in a rage, will be obliged to consent. Oh! cruel revolution, what are we

\* Letter 154, anno 1767.

" not

“ not to expect in the next century, the axe is at  
 “ the root of the tree. ‘On one side the philoso-  
 “ phers openly attack the abuses of a sainted  
 “ superstition; on the other, *princes by the abuses*  
 “ *of dissipation* are forced to lay violent hands on  
 “ the goods of these recluse, who are the props  
 “ and trumpeters of fanaticism. This edifice  
 “ fapped in its foundations, is on the eve of fall-  
 “ ing, and nations shall inscribe on their annals,  
 “ that Voltaire was the promoter of the revolu-  
 “ tion, operated, during the nineteenth century,  
 “ in the human mind \*.”

Further  
 avowals  
 of D'A-  
 lembert  
 and Vol-  
 taire.

A long while fluctuating between the king and the Sophister, Frederick had not yet yielded to the solicitations of the conspirators. D'Alembert was particularly pressing in his; we see how much he was bent on the success by his following letter to Voltaire. “ My venerable Patriarch,  
 “ do not accuse me of want of zeal in the good  
 “ cause, no one perhaps serves it more than my-  
 “ self. Do you know with what I am occupied  
 “ at present? With nothing less than the expul-  
 “ sion of the Jesuitical rabble, from Silesia; and  
 “ your former disciple is but too willing, on ac-  
 “ count of the numerous and perfidious treacheries  
 “ he experienced through their means, as he says  
 “ himself, during the last war; I do not send a

• 5th May, 1767.

“ single

“ single letter to Berlin without repeating, *That*  
 “ *the philosophers of France are amazed, that the*  
 “ *king of philosophers, that the declared protector of*  
 “ *philosophy* should be so *dilatory*, in following the  
 “ example of the kings of France or Portugal.  
 “ These letters are read to the king, who is very  
 “ sensible, as you know, to what the true believers  
 “ may think of him; and this sense will, without  
 “ doubt, produce a good effect, by the help of  
 “ God’s grace, which, as the scripture very pro-  
 “ perly remarks, turns the heart of kings like a  
 “ water-cock \*.”

It is a loathsome task to copy all this low buffoonery with which D’Alembert would season his dark plots, and the unconcern of his clandestine persecution, against a society of men, whose only crime was their respect and reverence for Christianity. I pass over many more expressions of this stamp, or more indecent; it will suffice for my object, to show how little, how empty, how despicable, these proud and mighty men were, when seen in their true light.

In spite of all these solicitations, Frederick was invincible, and fifteen years after, he still protected and preserved *his Dear Jesuits*. This expression in his mouth, when he at length sacrificed them to the conspiracy, may be looked upon as an answer

• D’Alembert to Voltaire, 15th Dec. 1763.

to what D'Alembert had written of their treachery to the king; it might prove with what unconcern, calumny or supposed evidence of others, were adduced as proofs by him; as in another place he says, Frederick is not a man, *to confine within his royal breast*, the subjects of complaint he may have had against them\*, as had been the case with the king of Spain, whose conduct in that respect had been so much blamed by the Sophisters†.

Their  
fears of  
the recall  
of the Je-  
suits.

These sophistical conspirators were not to be satisfied by the general expulsion of the Jesuits, from the different states of the kings of the earth. But by their reiterated cries, Rome was at length to be forced *to declare the total extinction of the order*. We may observe this in a work, in which Voltaire particularly interests himself, and whose sole object, was to obtain that extinction. At length it was obtained. France too late perceiving the blow it had given to public education, without appearing to recoil, many of her leading men, seeking to remedy the mistake, formed the plan of a new society solely destined to the education of youth. In this the former Jesuits, as the most habituated to education, were to be admitted. On the first news of this plan, D'Alembert spread the alarm;

\* 24th July 1767.

† D'Alembert to Voltaire, 4th May 1767.

he



he sees the Jesuits returning to life ; he writes again and again to Voltaire ; he sends the counter-plan. He lays great stress on the danger that *would result from thence, for the state, for the king, and for the Duke D'Aiguillon*, during whose administration, the destruction had taken place ; *also on the impropriety of placing youth under the tuition of any community of priests whatever* : they were to be represented *as ultramontains by principle and as anti-citizens*. Our barking philosophist then concluding in his cant to Voltaire, says, *Raton (cat), this chestnut requires to be covered in the embers, and to be handled by a paw as dextrous as that of Raton, and so saying I tenderly kiss those dear paws*. Seized with the same panic, Voltaire sets to work, and asks for fresh instructions. He considers what turn can be given to this affair, much too serious to be treated with ridicule alone. D'Alembert insists \*, Voltaire at Ferney, writes against the recall, and the conspirators fill Paris and Versailles with their intrigues. The ministers are prevailed upon, the plan laid aside, youth left without instruction, and it is on such an occasion that Voltaire writes, " My dear friend, " I know not what is to become of me ; in the " mean time let us enjoy the pleasure of having " seen the Jesuits expelled †."

\* See Letters of 26th Feb., 5th and 22d March 1774.

† Let. to D'Alembert, 27th April- 1771.

This

This pleasure was but short, as D'Alembert, seized with a new panic, writes again to Voltaire, " I am told, for certain, that the Jesuitical rabble " is about to be reinstated in Portugal, in all but " the dress. This new Queen appears to be a " very *superstitious Majesty*. Should the King of " Spain chance to die, I would not answer for " that kingdom's not imitating Portugal. *Reason is undone should the enemy's army gain this " battle \*.*"

When I first undertook to show that the destruction of the Jesuits was a favourite object of the conspirators, and that it was essentially inherent to their plan of overthrowing the Christian religion, I promised to confine myself to the records and confessions of the Sophisters themselves. I have omitted, for brevity sake, several of great weight, even that written by Voltaire, fifteen years after their expulsion, wherein he flatters himself, *that by means of the court of Petersburg, he could succeed in getting them expelled from China, because those Jesuits, whom the Emperor of China had chosen to preserve at Peking, were rather CONVERTERS than Mathematicians* †.

Had the Sophisters been less sanguine, or less active, in the extinction of this order I should not have insisted so much on that object. But the very warfare they waged was a libel on Christianity ;

\* 23d June 1777.

† 8th Dec. 1776.

what

what! they had persuaded themselves that the religion of the Christians was the work of man, that the destruction of a few poor mortals, was to shake it to its very foundations? Had they forgotten that Christianity had flourished during fourteen centuries, before a Jesuit was heard of? Hell might open its gates wider after their destruction, but it was written that they should not prevail. The power and intrigues of the ministers of France, of a Choiseul or a Pompadour, plotting with a Voltaire; of a D'Aranda in Spain, the public friend of D'Alembert and the protector of infidelity; of a Carvalho in Portugal, the ferocious persecutor of the good; in fine, the intrigues of many other ministers, dupes or agents of the sophistical conspiracy, rather than politicians, may have extorted the bull of extinction from Ganganelli, by threats of schism: but did that pontiff, or any other Christian, believe that the power of the Gospel rested on the Jesuits? No: the God of the Gospel reigns above, he will one day judge the pontiff and the minister, the Jesuit and the Sophister.—It is certain that a body of twenty thousand religious dispersed throughout Christendom, and forming a succession of men, attending to the education of youth, applying to the study of science, both religious and prophane, must have been of the greatest utility both to church and state. The conspirators were not long before they

Vol. I.

H

perceived

perceived their error, and though they had done the Jesuits the honor to look upon them as the base on which the church rested, they found that Christianity had other succours left, that new plots were necessary, and with equal ardor, we shall see them attacking all other religious orders, as the third means of the Antichristian Conspiracy.

---

**CHAP.**

## CHAP. VI.

*Third Means of the Conspirators.—Extinction of all  
the Religious Orders.*

THE favorite theme of those who were inimical to religious orders, has been to shew their inutility both to church and state. But by what right shall Europe complain of a set of men, by whose care she has emerged from that savage state of the ancient Gauls or Germanni, by whose labours two-thirds of her lands have been cultivated, her villages built, her towns beautified and augmented. Shall the state complain of those men, who perpetually attending to the cultivation of lands which their predecessors had first tilled, furnish sustenance to the inhabitants; shall the inhabitant complain, when the village, the town, the country, from whence he comes, would not have existed, or remained uncultivated, but from their care. Shall men of letters complain, when, should they have been happy enough to have escaped the general ignorance and barbarity of Europe, they would perhaps, be vainly searching ruins in hopes of finding some fragment of ancient literature. Yes complain, all Europe complain! It is from

Charges  
against  
religious  
orders.

H 2

them,

them you learned your letters, and they have been abused but too much ; alas ! your forefathers learned to read, but we to read perversely ; they opened the temple of science, we half shut it again ; and the dangerous man is not he who is ignorant, but the half wise, who would pretend to wisdom.

Had any one been at the trouble of comparing the knowledge of the least learned part of the religious orders, with that of the generality of the laity, I have no doubt but the former would greatly have excelled the latter, though they had received their ordinary education. It is true, the religious were not versed in the sophisticated science of the age ; but often have I seen those very men, who upbraided with their ignorance, were happy in the sciences their occupations required. It was not only among the Benedictines, who have been more generally excepted from this badge of ignorance, but among all other orders that I have met with men, as distinguished by their knowledge, as by the purity of their morals. Could I, alas, extend this remark to the laity ! This, indeed, is a language very different from that, which the reader may have seen in the satiric declamations of the age ; but will satire satisfy his judgement. In the annals of the conspiring Sophisters, shall he find testimony borne of their services, and every scurrilous

scurrilous expression, shall be a new laurel in their crown.

The Jesuits were destroyed, the conspirators saw Christianity still subsisted, and they then said to each other, we must destroy the other religious orders, or we shall not triumph. Their whole plan is to be seen in a letter from Frederick, to which Voltaire gave occasion by the following: Frederick's plan.

“ Hercules went to fight the robbers and Bellerophon chimeras; I should not be sorry to behold Herculeses and Bellerophons delivering the earth, both from Catholic robbers and Catholic chimeras \*.” Frederick answers on the 24th of the same month: “ It is not the lot of arms to Frederick's plan for the destruction of the religious orders.  
 “ *destroy the wretch*, it shall perish by the arm of truth, and interested selfishness. If you wish me to explain this idea, my meaning is as follows.  
 “ —I have remarked as well as many others, that ~~in~~ those places where convents are the most numerous, are those where the people are most blindly attached to superstition. No doubt but if these asylums of fanaticism were destroyed, the people would grow tepid and see with indifference, the present objects of their veneration. The point would *be to destroy the cloisters*, at least to begin by lessening their number.  
 “ The time is come, the French and Austrian

\* 3d March, 1767.

H 3

“ govern-

“ governments are involved in debt ; they have  
 “ exhausted the resources of industry to discharge  
 “ them, and they have not succeeded ; the lure  
 “ of rich abbeys and well-endowed convents, is  
 “ tempting. By representing to them the preju-  
 “ dice cloistered persons occasion to the popula-  
 “ tion of their states, as well as the great abuse of  
 “ the numbers of *Cucullati*, who are spread  
 “ throughout the provinces ; also the facility of  
 “ paying off part of their debts, with the trea-  
 “ sures of those communities, who are without  
 “ heirs ; they might, I think, be made to adopt  
 “ this plan of reform ; and it may be presumed,  
 “ that after having enjoyed the secularization of  
 “ some good livings, their rapacity could crave  
 “ the rest.

“ Every government who shall adopt this plan,  
 “ *will be friendly to the philosophers*, and the pro-  
 “ moter of all those books, which attack popular  
 “ superstition, or the false zeal that would sup-  
 “ port it.

“ Here is a pretty little plan, which I submit to  
 “ the examination of the patriarch of Ferney ;  
 “ it is his province, as father of the faithful, to  
 “ rectify and put it in execution.

“ The patriarch may perhaps ask *what is to become*  
 “ *of the bishops ?* I answer, it is not yet time to  
 “ touch them. To destroy those, who stir up  
 “ the fire of fanaticism in the hearts of the people,  
 “ is



“ is the first step, and when the people are cooled, *the bishops will be but little personages, whom sovereigns in process of time, will dispose of as they please.*”

Voltaire relished such plans too much not to set a great value on them, and of course answered the King of Prussia: “ Your plan of attack against the *Christicole Superstition*, in that of the friarhood, is worthy a great captain. The religious orders once abolished, *error* is exposed to universal contempt. Much is written in France on this subject; every one talks of it, but it is not ripe enough as yet. People are not sufficiently daring in France, bigots are yet in power\*.”

Having read these letters, it would be ridiculous to ask of what service religious orders could be to the church. Certain it is, that many had fallen off from the austerity of their first institute; but even in this degenerate state we see Frederick making use of all his policy to overturn them, because his antichristian plots are thwarted by the zeal and example of these religious: because he thinks the church cannot be stormed, until the convents are carried as the outworks; and Voltaire traces the hand of the great captain, who had distinguished himself so emi-

\* 5th April 1767.

H 4

nently

nently by his military science in Germany, in the plan of attack against the *Cbristicole Superstition*. These religious corps were useful then, though branded with sloth and ignorance; they were a true barrier to impiety. Frederick was so much convinced of it, that when the Sophisters had already occupied all the avenues of the throne, he dared not direct his attacks against the Bishops, nor the body of the place, until the outworks were carried.

Voltaire writes to him on the 29th of July 1775,  
 “ We hope that philosophy which in France  
 “ *is near the throne*, will soon *be on it*. But that  
 “ is but hope, which too often proves fallacious.  
 “ There are so many people interested in the sup-  
 “ port of error and nonsense, so many dignities,  
 “ and such riches are annexed to the trade, that  
 “ the hypocrites, it is to be feared, will get the  
 “ better of the sages. Has not your Germany  
 “ transformed your principal ecclesiastics into so-  
 “ vereigns? Where is there an elector or a bishop,  
 “ who will side with reason against a sect, that  
 “ allows him two or three hundred thousand  
 “ pounds a-year?”

Frederick continued to vote for the war being carried on against the religious. It was too early to attack the bishops. He answers Voltaire,  
 “ All ~~that~~ you say of our German bishops is but  
 “ too true; they are the hogs fattened on the  
 “ tythes

“ tythes of Sion (such is their scurrilous language  
 “ in their private correspondence). But you know  
 “ likewise, that in the Holy Roman Empire, ancient  
 “ custom, the golden bull, *and such like antiquated*  
 “ *fooleries*, have given weight to established abuses.  
 “ One sees them, shrugs one’s shoulders, and things  
 “ jog on in the old way. If we wish to diminish  
 “ fanaticism, *we must not begin by the bishops.*  
 “ But if we succeed in lessening the friarhood,  
 “ especially the mendicant orders, the people will  
 “ cool, and they being less superstitious, will al-  
 “ low the powers *to bring down the bishops* as  
 “ best suits their states. *This is the only possible*  
 “ *mode of proceeding.* To silently undermine the  
 “ edifice hostile to reason, is to force it to fall of  
 “ itself\*.”

I began by saying, that the means of the con-  
 spirators would give new proofs of the reality of  
 the conspiracy, and of its object. Can any other  
 interpretation, than that of an Antichristian Conspi-  
 racy, be put on the whole sentences made use of in  
 their correspondence? How can we otherwise un-  
 derstand, *such is the only possible mode of proceeding, to*  
*undermine* the edifice of that religion, which they  
 are pleased to design by *Christicole Superstition*, as  
 fanatic or unreasonable; or in order to overthrow  
 its pontiffs, to seduce the people from its worship?

♦ 13th August 1775.

What

What then is conspiracy, if those secret machinations carried on between Ferney, Berlin and Paris, in spite of distances, be not so? What reader can be sufficiently blind not to see, that by the establishment of reason, it is only the overthrow of Christianity that is sought? It is indeed a matter of surprise, that the Sophisters should have so openly exposed their plans at so early a period.

Plan adopted in France on the religious.

In the mean time Voltaire was correct when he answers Frederick, that the plan of destruction was ardently pursued in France, ever since the expulsion of the Jesuits, and that by people who were in office. The first step taken was to put off the period of religious professions until the age of twenty-one, though the adepts in ministry would fain have deferred it till the age of twenty-five. That is to say, that of a hundred young people, who would have embraced that state, not two would have been able to follow their vocations; for what parent would let his child attain that age, without being certain of the state of life he would embrace. The remonstrances made by many friends to religion, caused the age fixed on by the edict, to be that of eighteen for women, and twenty-one for men. Nevertheless, this was looked upon as an act of authority exercised on those, who chose to consecrate themselves more particularly to the service of their God, and re-

cue

cue themselves from the danger of the passions, at that age when they are the most powerful. This subject had been very fully treated in the last Œcumenical Council, where the age for the profession of religious persons had been fixed at sixteen, with a term of five years to reclaim against their last vows, in case they did not choose to continue the religious life they had undertaken. And it had always been looked upon as a right inherent to the church, to decide on these matters, as may be seen in Chappelain's discourse on that subject. It would be ridiculous to repeat the favourite argument of their inutility to France, after what has been said in this chapter. What! pious works, edification and the instruction of the people useless to a nation! Besides, France was a lively example that the number of convents had not hurt its population, as few states were peopled in an equal proportion. If celibacy was to be attacked, she might have turned her eyes to her armies and to that numerous class of men, who lived in celibacy, and who perhaps ought to have been noticed by the laws. In fine, all further reclamations were useless. What had been foreseen came to pass, according to the wishes of the ministerial Sophisters. In many colleges the Jesuits being very ill replaced, youth neglected in their education, left a prey to their passions, or looking on the number of years they had to wait for their reception

tion into the religious state, as so much time lost, laid aside all thoughts of that state, and took to other employments. Some few, from want, engaged, but rather seeking bread than the service of their God, or else prone to vice and to their passions, which they had never been taught to subdue, reluctantly submitted to the rules of the cloister. Already there existed many abuses, but they daily increased; and while the number of religious was diminishing, their fervour languished, and public scandals became more frequent. This was precisely what the ministers wanted, to have a plea for the suppression of the whole; while their masters, more sanguine if possible, made the press teem with writings, in which neither satire nor calumny were spared.

Briennes  
prose-  
cutes the  
plan.

The person who seemed to second them with the greatest warmth, was that man who, after having persuaded his companions even, that he had some talent for governing, at length finished by only adding his name to those ministers, whom ambition may be said to have blinded even to stupidity. This man was Briennes, Archbishop of Toulouse, since Archbishop of Sens, afterwards prime minister, then a public apostate, and who died as universally hated and despised, as Necker himself appears to be at this day. Briennes will be more despised, when it shall be known that he was the friend and confidant of D'Alembert, and that in  
a com-

a commission for the reform of the religious orders, he wore the mitre, and exercised its powers as a D'Alembert would have done.

The clergy had thought it necessary to examine the means of reforming the religious, and of re-establishing their primitive fervor. The court seemed to enter into their views, and named counsellors of state to join the bishops in their deliberations on this subject, and called it the *Commission of Regulars*. A mixture of prelates, who are only to be actuated by the spirit of the church, and of statesmen solely acting from worldly views, could never agree; some few articles were supposed to have been settled; but all was in vain, and many, through disgust, abandoned the commission. Among the bishops were Mr. Dillon, Archbishop of Narbonne; Mr. de Boisgelin, Archbishop of Aix; Mr. de Cicè, Archbishop of Bourdeaux, and the famous Briennes, Archbishop of Toulouse.

The first, majestic in his person and noble in his eloquence, seems to have had but little to do in this affair, and soon withdrew. The talents and zeal shewn by the second in the national assembly, in defence of the religious state, will convince the reader that he might have given an opinion which the court did not wish to adopt; he also abandoned the commission. In the third we see, that if by accepting of the seals of the revolution, and by affixing

where, when their number was under ten, on the specious pretence, that the conventual rules were better observed where the number was greater. The bishops and the cardinal de Luynes in particular, objected the great services rendered in country places by these small convents, and how much they helped the curates, but all to no purpose; and Briennes had already contrived to suppress fifteen hundred convents before the revolution. Soon he would have advanced more rapidly, for by promoting and encouraging the complaints of the young religious against the elder, of the inferior against the superior, by cramping and thwarting their elections, he spread dissensions throughout the cloisters. On the other side, the ridicule and calumnies contrived by the Sophisters were so powerful, that few young men dared take the habit, while some of the ancients were *ashamed of wearing a gown covered with infamy* \*. Others at length, wearied out by these shuffling tricks, themselves petitioned to be suppressed.

Philosophism, with its principles of liberty and equality, was even gaining ground in their houses, with all its concomitant evils; the good religious shed tears of blood over those persecutions of Briennes, who alone would have effectuated those dreadful schemes planned by Voltaire

\* Voltaire to the King of Prussia, No. 15.

and



and Frederick. Their decline was daily more evident, and it was a prodigy that any fervor yet remained, though a greater prodigy still, when we see the fervor of many of those who had petitioned for their secularization, revive in the first days of the revolution. I know for certain that not one-third of those who had petitioned, dared take the oath, for apostacy stared ~~them~~ in the face. The tortuous intrigues of a Briennes had shaken them; but the direct attacks of the National Assembly opened their eyes, and they beheld astonished, in their suppression, the grand attack which had been levelled against Christianity.

Voltaire and Frederick did not live to see their plans accomplished, Briennes did; but claiming the honour, he only reaped the ignominy of them. Shame and remorse devoured him. With what pleasure we may speak of the piety of those chaste virgins, consecrated to the service of their God! With them his intrigues had been useless.

His attempt  
fruitless  
against  
the nuns.

They, more immediately under the direction of their bishops, had not been exposed to the anarchy and dissensions of a Briennes; their seclusion from the world, their professions at an earlier age (eighteen), their education within the walls of the convent, these were barriers against his intrigues; but with what admiration should we not behold those who from the pure motives of religion spent their lives in the service of the sick, whose cha-

Vol. I.

I

rity

rity, whose chaste modesty, though in the midst of the world, could make man believe them to be angels in human forms. These were far above the reach of calumny or of a Briennes, a pretence could not even be devised.

With a view to diminish the number of real nuns, he thought, that if he augmented those asylums for canoneesses, who have a much greater communication with the world, therefore more easily perverted, that novices would not be so numerous. But by an inconceivable oversight, unless he had some very deep and hidden scheme, these canoneesses were in future, to prove a certain number of degrees of nobility to enter these asylums, when before they had been open to all ranks in the state. One would have thought he meant to render the real nuns odious to the nobility, and the latter to all other classes, by applying foundations to particular ranks, which had ever been common to all.

These were reflections that Briennes little attended to ; he was laying his snares, while D'Alembert smiled at the idea, that soon both nuns and canoneesses would add to the common mass of ruin ; but these sacred virgins baffled all their cunning.

These  
plans con-  
summated  
by the Na-  
tional As-  
sembly.

Nothing less than all the despotic powers of the Constituent Assembly could prevail against them ; they were to be classed with the martyrs of that bloody September ; their fervor was impassible.

Edicts

Edicts worthy of Nero, exulting in the flames of burning Rome, are necessary to drive them from the altar, cannons and the satellites of that Constituent Assembly, march against them to enforce those edicts, and *thirty thousand women* are driven from their convents, in contradiction to a decree of that same assembly, promising to let them die peaceably in their asylums. Thus was the destruction of religious orders completed in France. It was then forty years since this plan had been dictated by the Sophisters to the ministers of his most Christian Majesty. But when accomplished, ministers are no more ! . . . The sacred person of the king, a prisoner in the towers of the Temple ! . . . The object of the abolition of religious orders was fulfilled ; religion was savagely persecuted in the person of its ministers ! But during the long period that preceded the triumph of the Sophisters, they had resorted to many other means with which I have to acquaint my reader.

---

## CHAP. VII.

*Fourth Means of the Conspirators—Voltaire's Colony.*

WHILST the conspirators were so much taken up with the destruction of the Jesuits, and of all other religious orders, Voltaire was forming a plan which was to give to impiety itself, both apostles and propogandists. This idea seems to have first struck him about the year 1760-61. Always ruminating the destruction of Christianity, he writes to D'Alembert, " Could  
 Object of this colony. " not five or six men of parts, who rightly understood each other, succeed after the example of twelve scoundrels, who have already succeeded \*." The object of this understanding has already been explained in a letter before quoted. " Let the real philosophers unite in a brotherhood, like the Free-masons; let them assemble and support each other; let them be faithful to the association. This secret academy will be far superior to that of Athens and to all those of Paris. But every one thinks but of himself,

\* Let. 69, anno 1760,

" and

“ and forgets that his most sacred duty *is to crush the wretch* \*.”

The conspirators never lost sight of this most sacred duty; they met with various obstacles; religion was still zealously defended in France, and Paris was not yet a proper asylum for such an association. It appears also that Voltaire was obliged for some time to lay this plan aside; but taking it up again, a few years afterwards, he applied to Frederick, as we are told by the editor of their correspondence, for leave “ to establish at Clèves a little colony of French philosophers, who might there, freely and boldly, speak the truth, *without fearing ministers, priests, or parliaments.*” Frederick answered with all the desired zeal, “ I see you wish to establish the little colony you had mentioned to me. — I think the shortest way would be, that those men, or your associates, should send to Cleves to see what would be most convenient for them, and what I can dispose of in their favor †.”

Frederick  
seconds  
this plan.

It is to be lamented that many letters respecting this colony have been suppressed in their correspondence; but Frederick's answers are sufficient to convince us of the obstinacy of Voltaire in the undertaking, who returning to the charge again,

\* Let. 85, to D'Alembert, 1761. † 24th October 1765.

is answered, " You speak of a colony of philosophers, who wish to establish themselves at Cleves. I have no objection to it. I can give them every thing but wood, the forests having been almost destroyed by your countrymen. But only on this condition, that *they will respect those who are to be respected*, and that they will keep within the *proper bounds of decency in their writings* \*."

The explanation of this letter, will be better understood, when we treat of the Antimonarchical Conspiracy. Decency in their writings, one should think, would be of the first necessity even for their own views, otherwise this new colony must have spread a general alarm, and governments would have been obliged to repress their barefaced impudence.

While on one side Voltaire was imploring the succour and protection of the King of Prussia, for these apostles of impiety, on the other he was seeking Sophisters worthy of the apostleship. He writes to Damilaville, that he is ready to make a sacrifice of all the sweets of Ferney, and go and place himself at their head. " Your friend, says he, persists in his idea; it is true, as you have remarked, that he must tear himself from many objects that are at present his delight, and then will be of his regret. But is it not

\* Letter 146, anno 1766.

" better

“ better to quit them through philosophy than by death. What surprises him most, is that many people have not taken this resolution together. Why should not a certain philosophic baron labor at the establishment of this colony? why should not so many others improve so fair an opportunity?” In the continuation of this letter we find that Frederick was not the only prince who countenanced the plan: “ Two sovereign princes, *who think entirely as you do*, have lately visited your friend. One of them offered a town, provided that which relates to the grand work, should not suit\*.”

It was precisely at the time this letter was written, that the Langrave of Hesse Cassel went to pay homage to the idol of Ferney. The date of his journey, the similarity of his sentiments, can leave little doubt, but what he was the prince who offered a town to the colony, should Cleves prove inconvenient †.

Meanwhile, the apostles of this mock Messiah, however zealous for the grand work, were not equally ready to sacrifice their ease. D'Alembert idolized by the Sophisters at Paris, saw that he could be but a secondary divinity in the presence of Voltaire. That Damilaville, celebrated by the impious patriarch as personally hating God, was

Coolness  
of the  
conspira-  
tors for  
this colo-  
ny.

\* Letter of the 6th of August 1766.

† Letter of the Langrave, 9th Sept. 1766.

necessary for carrying on the secret correspondence in Paris. Diderot, the certain philosophic Baron, and the remaining multitude of adepts, reluctantly cast their eyes on a German town, where they could not with equal ease, sacrifice in luxury and debauchery to their Pagan divinities. Such remissness disconcerted Voltaire. He endeavoured to stimulate their ardor by asking, "If six or  
 " seven hundred thousand Huguenots left their  
 " country for the *fooleries of Jean Chauvin*, shall  
 " not twelve sages be found, who will make some  
 " little sacrifice to reason which is trampled on \*."

When he wishes to persuade them, that their consent is all that is necessary to accomplish the grand object, he writes again, "All that I can  
 " tell you now, by a sure hand, is, that every  
 " thing is ready for the establishment of the  
 " manufacture; more than one Prince envies the  
 " honor of it, and from the borders of the Rhine  
 " unto the Oby, Tomplat (that is Plato Diderot)  
 " will be honored, encouraged, and live in security." He would then repeat the grand object of the conspiracy, in hopes of persuading the conspirators. He would seek to inflame their hearts with that hatred for Christ, which was consuming his own. He would repeatedly cry out, *Crush, crush the wretch, then crush the wretch †.*

\* Letter to Damilaville, 18th of August 1766.

† Letter to Damilaville, 25th of August 1766.

His



His prayers, his repeated solicitations could not avail against the sweets of Paris. That same reason which made Voltaire willing to sacrifice all the pleasing scenes of Ferney, to bury himself in the heart of Germany, there to consecrate his days and writings to the extinction of Christianity, that reason, I say, taught the younger adepts that the sweets of Paris were not to be neglected. They were not the Apostles of the Gospel preaching temperance and mortification both by word and example; so indeed, was Voltaire obliged to give up all hopes of expatriating his sophistical apostles. He indignantly expresses his vexation to Frederick a few years afterwards: “ I own to you, that I was so much vexed and so much ashamed of the little success I had in the transmigration to Cleves, that I have never since dared propose any of my ideas to your Majesty. When I reflect that a fool and an idiot, like St. Ignatius, should have found twelve followers, and that I could not find three Philosophers, who would follow me, I was almost tempted to think, that reason was useless \*. I shall never recover the non-execution of this plan, it was there I should have ended my old age †.”

However violent Voltaire was in his reproaches against the other conspirators, the sequel of these

\* Nov. 1769. † 12th of Oct. 1770.

memoirs

memoirs will show that it was unjustly. D'Alembert in particular had far other plans to prosecute ; he grasped at the empire of the academic honors, and without exposing his dictatorship, or expatriating the adepts, by distributing these honors solely to the Sophisters, he abundantly replaced Voltaire's so much regretted plan. This means and the method by which it was forwarded, shall be the subject of the ensuing chapter.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Fifth Means of the Conspirators.—The Academic Honors.*

THE protection which the kings had given to men of letters, had brought them into that repute which they so well deserved, until abusing their talents, they turned them against religion and governments. It was in the French academy where glory seemed to be enthroned, and a seat within its walls, was the grand pursuit of the orator and the poet, in fine of all writers, whether eminent in the historic or any other branch of literature. Corneille, Bossuet, Racine, Maffillon, La Bruyère, Lafontaine, in fine, all those authors who had adorned the reign of Louis XIV were proud of their admission within this sanctuary of letters. Morals and the laws seemed to guard its entrance, lest it might be prophaned by the impious. Any public sign of incredulity, was a bar against admission, even during the reign of Louis XV. Nor was the famous Montesquieu himself admitted until he had given proper satisfaction, on account of certain articles contained in his *Persian Letters*.—Voltaire pretends that he deceived the Cardinal de Fleury, by sending him a new edition

First object of the academy.

edition of his work, in which all the objectionable parts had been omitted. Such a low trick was beneath Montefquieu, repentance was his only plea, and later, little doubt can be left of his repenting sincerely. In fine, on admission, impiety was openly renounced, and religion publicly avowed.

D'Alembert's  
plan on  
the aca-  
demies.

Boindin, whose incredulity was notorious, had been rejected, though a member of several other academies. Voltaire was for a long time unable to gain admission, and at length only succeeded by means of high protection and that low hypocrisy which we shall see him recommending to his disciples. D'Alembert, ever provident, hid his propensity to incredulity until he had gained his seat; and though the road to these literary honors had been much widened by the adepts who surrounded the court, nevertheless, he thought that it would not be impossible, by dint of intrigues, to turn the scale; that if formerly impiety had been a means of exclusion, in future it might be a title of admission, and that none should be seated near him, but those whose writings had rendered them worthy abettors of the conspiracy, and supporters of their sophistical arts. His true field was that of petty intrigue, and so successfully did he handle it, that in the latter times, the titles of Academician and Sophister were nearly synonymous. It is true that sometimes he met with obstacles; and the

the plot framed between him and Voltaire, for the admission of Diderot, will be sufficient to evince what great advantages they expected would accrue to their conspiracy, by this new means of promoting irreligion.

D'Alembert first proposed it, Voltaire received <sup>Intrigues for Diderot.</sup> the proposal with all the attention due to its importance, and answers, "You wish Diderot to be of the academy, it must then be brought about." The king was to approve of the nomination, and D'Alembert feared ministerial opposition. It is to this fear that we owe the account Voltaire has given of Choiseul, it is then, he mentions his partiality to the Sophisters, and that so far from obstructing the like plots, he would forward them with all his power; "In a word, he continues, Diderot must be of the academy, it will be the most noble revenge that can be taken for the play against the philosophers. The academy is incensed at le Franc-de-Pompignan; it would willingly give him a most swinging slap.—I will make a bonfire on Diderot's admission. Ah! what a happiness it would be, if Helvetius and Diderot could be received together\*."

D'Alembert would have been equally happy in such a triumph, but he was on the spot and saw

• 9th of July 1760.

the

the opposition made by the Dauphin, the Queen and the Clergy; he answers, "I should be more  
 " desirous than yourself to see Diderot of the  
 " academy. *I am perfectly sensible how much the*  
 " *common cause would be benefited by it*, but the  
 " impossibility of doing it, is beyond what you  
 " can conceive \*."

Voltaire knowing that Choiseul and La Pompadour had often prevailed against the Dauphin, ordered D'Alembert not to despond. He takes the direction of the intrigue on himself, and places his chief hopes on the Courtesan. "Still further,  
 " (says he), she may look upon it as an honor,  
 " and make a merit of supporting Diderot. Let  
 " her undeceive the king on his score, and delight  
 " in quashing a cabal which she despises †." What D'Alembert could not personally undertake, Voltaire recommends to the courtiers, and particularly to the Count D'Argental: "My divine  
 " Angel, would he write, do but get Diderot to  
 " be of the academy, it will be the boldest stroke  
 " that can be in the game reason is playing against  
 " fanaticism and folly (*that is religion and piety*);  
 " impose for penance on the Duke de Choiseul  
 " to introduce Diderot into the academy ‡."

The secretary of the academy, Duclos, is also called in, as an auxiliary by Voltaire, who gives

\* 18th July 1760. † 28th July 1760.

‡ Letter 153, anno 1760.

him

him instructions to insure the success of the recipiendary adept. " Could not you represent, or  
 " cause to be represented, how very essential such  
 " a man is to you for the completion of some  
 " necessary work? Could not you *after having*  
 " *slyly played off that battery* assemble *seven or eight*  
 " *of the elect*, and form a deputation to the king,  
 " to ask for Diderot as the most capable of for-  
 " warding your enterprize? Would not the Duke  
 " of Nivernois help you in that project, would  
 " not he be the speaker on the occasion? The  
 " bigots will say, that Diderot has written a  
 " metaphysical work which they do not under-  
 " stand: *Deny the fact, say that he did not write it,*  
 " *and that he is a good Catholic—it is so easy to be a*  
 " *Catholic* \*."

It would be an object of surprise to the reader and to the historian to see Voltaire straining every nerve, calling on Dukes and courtiers, not blushing at the vilest hypocrisy, advising base dissimulation, and that merely to gain the admission of one of his fellow conspirators, into the academy; but this surprise will cease when they see D'Alembert's own words: *I am perfectly sensible how much the common cause would be benefited by it*; or in other words, the war we are waging against Christianity. These words will explain all his agitation. And

\* Letter 11th of August 1760.

to have admitted within the sanctuary of letters, the man the most notorious for his incredulity, would it not have been corroborating the fault government had committed, in letting itself be led away by the hypocritical demonstrations of a Voltaire or a D'Alembert? Would it not have been crowning the most scandalous impiety with the laurels of literature, and declaring that Atheism so far from being a stain, would be a new title to its honors? The most prejudiced must own it would have been an open contempt for religion, and Choiseul and La Pompadour were conscious, that it was not yet time to allow the conspirators such a triumph. D'Alembert even shrunk back when he beheld the clamours it would excite, and desisted for the present. But the critical moment was now come, when the ministers secretly abetted, what they publicly seemed to wish to crush. D'Alembert persisted in his hopes, that with some contrivance he would soon be able to exclude all writers from literary honors, who had not offered some sacrifice at least, to the Antichristian Sophistry, and he at length succeeded.

Success of the conspirators, and list of the principal academicians. From the time when D'Alembert had conceived of what importance the French academy, converted into a club of irreligious Sophisters, might be to the conspiracy, let us examine the merits of some of those who were admitted among its members. First, we find Marmontel perfectly coinciding



coinciding in opinion with Voltaire, D'Alembert and Diderot; then in succession, La Harpe the favorite adept of Voltaire; Champfort, the adept and hebdomadary co-adjutor of Marmontel and La Harpe; a Lemierre distinguished by Voltaire as *a staunch enemy to the wretch*, or Christ \*; an Abbé Millot whose sole merit with D'Alembert was his total oblivion of his priesthood, and with the public to have transformed the history of France into an antipapal one †; a Briennes, long since known to D'Alembert as an enemy to the church, though living in its bosom; a Suar, a Gaillar, and lastly a Condorcet, whose reception was to enthrone the fiend of atheism within the walls of the academy.

It does not appear why Mr. de Turgot did not succeed in his admission, though seconded by all the intrigues of D'Alembert and Voltaire ‡. In casting an eye on their correspondence, the reader would be surprised to see of what concern it was to them to fill this philosophical Sanhedrim with their favorite adepts. There are above thirty letters on the admission of their adepts, or on the exclusion of those who were friendly to religion. Their intrigues, whether through protection or any other way, were at length so successful, that

\* Letter from Voltaire to Damilaville, 1767.<sup>©</sup>

† Letter of D'Alembert, 27th Dec. 1777.

‡ Letter of Voltaire, 8th of Feb. 1776.

in a few years, the name of Academician and Atheist or Deist were synonymous. If there were yet to be found among them some few men, especially bishops, of a different stamp from Briennes, it was a remains of deference shown them, which some might have mistaken for an honor, whilst they should have looked upon it as an insult, to be seated next to a D'Alembert, a Marmontel or a Condorcet.

There was however among the forty, a layman much to be respected for his piety. This was Mr. Beauzet. I one day asked him, how it had been possible, that a man of his morality could ever have been associated with men so notoriously unbelievers? "The very same question (he answered), have I put to D'Alembert. At one of the sittings, seeing that I was nearly the only person who believed in God, I asked him, how he possibly could ever have thought of me for a member, when he knew that my sentiments and opinions differed so widely from those of his brethren? D'Alembert without hesitation (added Mr. Beauzet) answered, I am sensible of your amazement, but we were in want of a skilful grammarian, and among our party, not one had made himself a reputation in that line. We knew that you believed in God, but being a good sort of man, we cast our eyes on you, for

“ for want of a philosopher to supply your  
“ place.”

Thus was the sceptre wrested from the hands of science and talents, by the hand of impiety. Voltaire had wished to place his conspirators under the protection of the Royal Sophister; D'Alembert stopped their flight, and made them triumph in the very states of that monarch, who gloried in the title of Most Christian. His plot, better laid, conferred the laurels of literature solely on the impious writer, whilst he who dared defend religion, was to be covered with reproach and infamy. The French academy thus converted into a club of infidels, was a far better support to the Sophisters conspiring against Christianity, than any colony which Voltaire could have conceived. The academy infected the men of letters, and these perverted the public opinion by that torrent of impious productions, which deluged all Europe. These were to be instrumental in bringing over the people to universal apostacy, and will be considered by us, as the sixth means for the Antichristian revolution.

## CHAP. IX.

*Sixth Means of the Conspirators.—Inundation of  
Antichristian Writings.*

Concert  
of the  
chiefs in  
their  
writings.

THAT for these forty years past, and particularly for the last twenty of Voltaire's life, all Europe has been overrun with most impious writings, whether under the forms of pamphlets, systems, romances or pretended histories, is one of those self-evident truths which needs no proof. Though I shall in this place confine myself only to a part of what I have to say on this subject, I will here show how the chiefs of the conspiracy acted in concert, whether in the production, the multiplication or distribution of them, in order to disseminate their poisons throughout Europe.

The method to be observed in their own works, was particularly concerted between Voltaire, D'Alembert and Frederick. We see them, in their letters, confiding to each other the different works they are writing against Christianity, their hopes of success and their arts to ensure it. We see them smile at the snares they have laid against religion, and that particularly, in those works and systems which they affected most to look upon as indif-

indifferent to, or as rather promoting than attacking religion. In that style D'Alembert was admirable. The following example will convince the historian, or the reader, of the great art of this crafty Sophister.

It is well known, with what immense pains our philosophers of the day, have been forming their pretended physical systems on the formation of the globe, their numerous theories and genealogies of the earth. We have seen them diving into mines, splitting mountains or digging up their surface in search of shells, to trace old ocean's travels, and build their epochs. These numerous researches, to hear them talk, had no other end but the advancement of science and natural philosophy. Their new epochs were not to affect religion, and we have reason to believe that many of our naturalists had no other object in view, as many of them, real men of learning and of candour in their researches, and capable of observation, have rather furnished arms against, than forwarded those vain systems by their studies, labours or peregrinations: not such the case with D'Alembert and his adepts. They soon perceived that these new epochs and systems drew the attention of divines, who had to maintain the truth of the facts and the authenticity of the books of Moses, the foundation and title-pages of Revelation. To baffle the Sorbonne and all the defenders of sacred

Cunning  
of D'A-  
lembert  
with re-  
gard to  
systems.

K 3

writ,

writ, D'Alembert writes a work under the title of *The Abuse of Criticism*, a real apology of all those systems. The main drift of the work, was with showing a great respect for religion, to prove that neither revelation, nor the credibility of Moses, could be the least affected by these theories or epochs, and that the alarms of the divines were ungrounded. Many pages were dedicated to prove that these systems could only serve to raise our ideas to the grand and sublime. That so far from *counteracting the power of God, or his divine wisdom*, they only *displayed it more*; that considering the object of their researches, *it little became the divine, but the natural philosopher to judge of them*. Divines are represented as *narrow-minded, pusillanimous, or enemies to reason*, terrified at an object which did not so much as regard them. He is very pointed in his writings against those pretended panics, and among other things says, "They have sought to connect Christianity with systems purely philosophical. In vain did religion, so simple and precise in its tenets, constantly throw off the alloy that disfigured it, and it is from that alloy the notion has prevailed, of its being attacked in works where it was the least so \*."

These are precisely the works where, for the formation of the universe, *a much longer space of time is required*, than the history of the creation,

\* The Abuse of Criticism, Nos. 4, 15, 16, 17.

delineated

delineated by Moses, leaves us at liberty to suppose.

Who but would have thought D'Alembert convinced that all those physical systems, those theories, *and longer space of time*, so far from overturning Christianity, would only serve to raise the grandeur and sublimity of our ideas of the God of Moses and of the Christians. But that same D'Alembert, while seeking this *longer space of time*, anticipated his applause to the lie, which his travelling adepts were about to give to Moses and to revelation. Those adepts rambling in the mountains of the Alps or the Appenines, are the men he points out to Voltaire *as precious to philosophy*. It is he who, after having been so tender for the honor of Moses and revelation, writes to Voltaire, " This letter, my dear companion, will be delivered to you by Desmarets, a man of merit and  
" of sound philosophy, who wishes to pay his respects to you on his journey to Italy, where he  
" purposes *making such observations on natural history,*  
" *as may very well give the lie to Moses.* He will  
" not say a word of this to the master of the sacred palace, but if perchance, *he should discover*  
" *that the world is more ancient than even the septuagint pretend,* he will not keep it a secret from  
" you \*."

\* Let. 137, 1763.

D'Alembert directs Voltaire in his writings.

It would have been difficult to use more art, though it were to direct the hand of an assassin; D'Alembert would sometimes direct Voltaire, when shafts were to be sent from Ferney, which could not yet be shot from Paris. On these occasions the theme was already made, and only needed the last gloss of Voltaire's pen.

When, in 1763, the Sorbonne published that famous Thesis, which foretold what the French revolution has since taught the sovereigns of Europe, on the evil tendency of this modern philosophism to their very thrones; D'Alembert, in haste, informs Voltaire of the exigency of counteracting an impression so detrimental to the conspiracy. He shews Voltaire how to impose on the kings themselves, and how to involve the church in all their doubts and suspicions. In tracing this master-piece of art and cunning, he reminds him of the contests long since extinct, between the priesthood and the empire, and lets him into the whole art of throwing odium and suspicion on the clergy \*. Many other plans are proposed to the patriarch according to circumstances †. Those were in his style *the chestnuts* that *Bertrand* (D'Alembert) *pointed out under the ashes*, and which *Raton* (Voltaire) was to help him to draw out of the fire with *his delicate paw*.

\* Let. of D'Alembert, 18th Jan. and 9th Feb. 1773.

† Particularly let. of 26th Feb. and 22d March 1774.

Voltaire



Voltaire did not fail, on his part, to inform <sup>Their</sup> D'Alembert and the other adepts, of what he him- <sup>concert.</sup> self composed, or of the steps he took with ministry. It is thus that as a prelude to the plundering decrees of the revolution, he gave Count D'Argental notice of the memorial he had sent to the Duke de Praslin, to prevail on that minister to deprive the clergy of part <sup>of</sup> its maintenance by abolishing tythes \*.

These secret memorials, the anecdotes, whether true or slanderous against the religious writers, were all concerted among the conspirators and their chiefs †. Even [to] the smiles, the witticisms or insipid epigrams of the adepts, were under the direction of Voltaire, and used by him as forwarding the conspiracy. He, better than any man, knew the powers of ridicule, and he would often recommend it to the adepts in their writings or in their conversation. "Do your best, he writes "to D'Alembert, to preserve your chearfulness, "always endeavour *to crush the wretch*. I only "ask five or six witticisms a day; that would "suffice. *It* would not get the better of them. "Laugh Democritus, make me laugh, and the "sages shall carry the day ‡."

\* Let. to the Count D'Argental, 1764.

† Letters of Voltaire and D'Alembert, 18 and 20.

‡ Let. 128.

Voltaire

Voltaire was not always of the same opinion, with regard to this attack on Christianity. This method was not sufficiently elevated for a philosopher, and he soon after adds, in his quality of chief, *To the flood of jests and sarcasms*, there should succeed, *some serious work, which however should be worth reading*, for the justification of the philosophers, and the confusion of *the wretch* \*. This work, notwithstanding the exhortations of the chief, and his union with the adepts, never was executed. But on the other side, the press teemed with deistical and atheistical works, fraught with calumny and impiety. Monthly or weekly some new production of the most daring impiety was printed in Holland. Such were the *Philosophic Soldier*, *The Doubts*, *Priestcraft*, *Blackguardism unveiled* †, which are nearly the most profligate the sect has produced. One would have thought Voltaire alone presided over this traffic of impiety, such was his zeal in promoting the sale of them. He received notice of the publications, which he communicated to his brethren at Paris. He recommended their getting them, circulating them; upbraided them with their little ardor in spreading them abroad, while he himself dispersed them

Circulation of these works urged.

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 67.

† *Le Militaire Philosophe*, *Les Doubts*, *l'Imposture Sacerdotale*, *Le Polissonisme dévoilé*.

all

all around him \*. To stimulate them, he would write, that it was out of these works *that all the German youth learned to read; in short, that they were the universal catechisms from Baden to Moscow †.*

When he thought Holland could not sufficiently infect France with these profligate writings, he would select those which D'Alembert was to get privately printed at Paris, and then distribute them by thousands. Such, for example, was the pretended *Survey of Religion*, by Dumarçais. "They have sent me," these are Voltaire's own words, "a work of Dumarçais AScribed to St. Evremond. It is an excellent work (precisely one of the most impious). I exhort you, my dear brother, to prevail on some one of our faithful and beloved, to reprint this little work, which may do a great deal of good ‡." Like exhortations, but rather more pressing, he made with regard to the *Last Will of Jean Meslier*, of that famous Curate of Etrepigni, whose apostacy and blasphemies could make still stronger an impression on the minds of the populace. Voltaire would complain that there were not so many copies of that impious work in all Paris, as he himself had dispersed throughout the mountains of Switzerland §.

\* See his letters to Count D'Argental, to Mad. du Deffant and particularly to D'Alembert, No. 2, 1769.

† Let. to the Count D'Argental, 26th Sept. 1766.

‡ Let. 122.

§ Let. of D'Alembert, 3d of July, and of Voltaire, 15th Sept. 1762.

D'Alem-

D'Alembert's excuse.

D'Alembert was himself obliged to apologize as if indifferent and deficient in point of zeal, but particularly for not having dared, at the entreaties of Voltaire, to *print in Paris and distribute four or five thousand copies of John Meslier's Last Will*. His excuse shows the consummate conspirator, who knows how to wait the moment, and take precautions to ensure that success, which too great precipitancy might have ruined \*. We see by what he writes to Voltaire on a master-piece of impiety, entitled *Good Sense*, that he was perfectly aware of the effect these impious works had on the minds of the people; that he knew when they were to be multiplied or cast into the hands of the vulgar; he says, "This production (*Good Sense*) is a work "much more to be dreaded than the *System of Nature*." It really was so, because, with greater art and unconcern, it leads to the most unqualified Atheism; and for that reason we see D'Alembert setting forth the advantages to be derived from it to the conspiracy if it were abridged, though already but small, *so as to cost no more than five-pence, and thus to be fitted for the pocket and the reading of every cook-maid* †.

These low intrigues were not the only means the Sophisters resorted to, to evade the law, and overrun all Europe with these Antichristian pro-

\* Let. 102.

† Let. 146.

ductions.

ductions. They were supported at court by Their powerful men, or ministerial adepts, who knew how to silence the law itself, or if it ever was to speak, it was only the better to favour this impious traffic, at another time, in spite of the magistracy. The duke de Choiseul and Malesherbes were again the promoters of this grand means of robbing the people of their religion, and insinuating the errors of philosophism. The former, with all the assurance of ministerial despotism, threatened the Sorbonne with all the weight of his indignation, when by their public censures, they sought to guard the people against those ephemeral productions. It was this strange exertion of authority, which made Voltaire exclaim, *Long live the ministry of France; above all, long live the Duke of Choiseul!* \*

Malesherbes, who, having the superintendency over the whole of bookselling, and hence enabled to evade the law, both as to the introduction and circulation of these impious writings, was on that object, in perfect unison with D'Alembert. They both would willingly have hindered the champions of religion from printing their replies to that legion of infidels then rising in France. But the time was not yet come. With his pretended toleration, Voltaire was indignant, that under a phi-

\* Let. of Voltaire to Marmontel, 1767.

losophic

Concert  
of Vol-  
taire and  
Frederick  
on this  
object.

losophic minister, the apologists of the Gospel, should still have access to the press, and D'Alembert is obliged to plead in his defence, that Malesherbes, so far from favoring the antiphilosophic works, had reluctantly been obliged *to submit to superior orders*, which he could not resist \*. Not content with a simple connivance, such excuses were not satisfactory to Voltaire, nothing less than the authority of kings could second his zeal, and he has again recourse to Frederick. This inundation of impious books, was to have been the grand object of his colony. As yet unconsoled for the failure of that plan, he writes to the king of the Sophisters, " Was I younger, had I health, " I would willingly quit, the house I have built, " the trees I have planted, to go and dedicate " with two or three philosophers, the remainder of " my life, under your protection, to the printing " of a few useful books. *But, Sire, cannot you, " without exposing yourself, have some of the Berlin " booksellers encouraged to reprint them, and to dis- " tribute them throughout Europe, at a price low " enough to ensure their sale †.*"

This proposal, which transformed the king of Prussia into the hawker-general of Antichristian pamphlets, did not displease his protecting majesty. " You may (answers Frederick) *make*

\* Let. of 15th Jan. 1757.

† 5th April 1767.

" use

" *use of our printers as you please*, they enjoy perfect liberty, and as they are connected with those of Holland, France and Germany, I have no doubt, but that they have means of conveying books whithersoever they may think proper \*."

Even at Petersburg, Voltaire had found hawkers of these impious productions. Under the protection, and by the influence of Count Schouvallov, Russia was to petition Diderot, *for leave to be honoured with* the impression of the Encyclopedia, and Voltaire is commissioned to announce that triumph to Diderot †. The most impious and most seditious work Helvetius had written, was then reprinting at the Hague, and the Prince Gallitzin dares to dedicate it to the Empress of all the Russias. Here Voltaire's zeal was out-run by his success. He could not help remarking, with what amazement the world would see such a work inscribed to the most despotic sovereign on earth ; but whilst he smiled at the imprudence and folly of the prince adept, he exultingly beheld *the flock of fages silently increasing*, since princes themselves were no less eager than himself, in the circulation of these antichristian writings. We find this account repeated three different times in his letters to D'Alembert, so great was his joy, and so confi-

\* 5th May, 1767.

† Let. of Voltaire to Diderot.  
dent

dent was he of annihilating all idea of Christianity in the minds of the people by this means.

In this chapter we have only treated of the solicitude with which the chiefs sought to infuse the poison of their writings into the minds of the people; <sup>hereafter</sup> later we shall see the means employed by the sect, to extend it to the hovel or the cottage, and to imbibe that low rabble with its impious principles, though we have seen Voltaire so little desirous of such a conquest.

---

*Note to* CHAP. IX.

*On those Works which are more particularly recommended by the Conspirators.*

Their doctrine. Were I less acquainted with a certain, though numerous class of readers, I might look upon the observations I am about to make, on the doctrine of those works which the chiefs of the conspiracy, independently of their own, sought to circulate through all classes of society, as superfluous. I have not only to satisfy men difficult of conviction, but persuade men who will resist evidence itself, unless it overwhelms them. In spite of all the proofs we have already adduced of the conspiracy formed and carried on by Voltaire, D'Alembert, Frederick, Diderot and their adepts against the vitals of Christianity, will nobody recur again to say, that the Sophisters only levelled their writings at the abuses, or at least that Catholicity was their only aim, and that they never meant to attack the divers other religions that are within the pale of Christianity, whether at Geneva or London, in Germany or Sweden. The extreme falsity of such an argument renders it absurd. If we do but reflect for a moment on the nature of those works, which the Sophisters circulated with



With so much zeal; could they wish to disseminate other principles than those preached up in these works? Let us appeal to them and see if the destruction of abuses, or even of Catholicity alone, could have been their sole object. That the conspiracy was general, proved by these works.

The works we have seen so highly recommended by Voltaire and D'Alembert, are particularly those of Freret, Boulanger, Helvetius, John Meslier, Dumarfais and Maillet, or at least they bear the name of these Sophisters. They are once more, THE PHILOSOPHIC SOLDIER, THE DOUBTS OR THE SAGE'S SCEPTICISM, GOOD SENSE, whose authors remain unknown. I will lay before the reader the divers opinions, broached by these writers, so much commended by the Sophisters, concerning those points which cannot be invalidated, without overthrowing the very foundation of Christianity. Then let any one conclude that the conspiracy only impugned abuses, or some particular branch of Christianity.

The absolute belief of the existence of a God, belongs to every religion that is Christian; let us then examine their doctrine as to a God.

Freret tells us expressly, "*The universal cause, that God of the philosophers, of the Jews and of the Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom.*" The same author continues, "Imagination daily creates fresh chimeras, which raise in them that impulse of fear, and such is the phantom of the Deity \*."

Doctrine of these works: Of God.

The author of *Good Sense*, or of that work which D'Alembert wishes to see abridged, in order to sell it for five-pence to the poor and ignorant, is not so emphatical; but what is his doctrine? "*That the phenomena of nature only prove the existence of God to a few prepossessed men,*" that is to say, full of false prejudices; "*that the wonders of nature,*

\* Letter from Thrasybulus to Lucippus, page 164 and 254.

VOL. I.

L

" so

“ *so far from bespeaking a GOD, are but the necessary effects of  
“ matter prodigiously diversified \**.”

*The Philosophic Soldier* does not deny the existence of GOD, but sets off, in his first chapter, by a monstrous comparison between *Jupiter* and the GOD of the Christians, and the pagan god carries all the advantage of the discussion.

According to the *Christianity Unveiled*, which appeared under the name of Boulanger, it is more reasonable to admit with Manes of a twofold God, than of the GOD of Christianity †.

The author of *the Doubts* or of Scepticism, informs the world, “ That they cannot know whether a GOD really  
“ exists, or whether there exists the smallest difference  
“ between good and evil or vice and virtue.” Such is the drift of the whole of that work †.

On the  
Soul.

We find the same opposition to Christianity in their doctrines on the spirituality of the SOUL. With Freret, “ every thing that is called *Spirit* or *SOUL*, has no more  
“ reality than the phantoms, the chimeras or the sphinxes §.”

The Sophister of the pretended *Good Sense*, heaps up arguments anew to prove, that it is the body that feels, thinks and judges, and that the SOUL is but a chimera ||.

Helvetius pronounces, “ That we are in an error, when  
“ we make of the SOUL a spiritual being; that nothing can be  
“ more absurd, and that the SOUL is not a distinct being from  
“ the body \*\*.”

Boulanger tells us decidedly, “ That the immortality of the  
“ SOUL, so far from stimulating man to the practice of

\* No. 36 et passim. † Page 101.

‡ Particularly No. 100 and 101.

§ Letter from Thrasybulus. || No. 20 and 100.

\*\* Of the Spirit, and of Man and his Education, No. 4 and 5.

“ virtue,

"virtue, is nothing but a *barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet*, and  
 "contrary to all legislation \*."

If from these fundamental tenets, essential to every reli- On Mora-  
 gion, as well as to Catholicity, we pass on to MORALITY, lity.  
 we shall find Freret teaching the people, that "all ideas of  
 "justice and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy,  
 "are purely arbitrary and dependent on custom †."

Helvetius will one while tell us, that the only rule by  
 which *virtuous actions* are distinguished from *vicious ones*, is  
 the law of princes, and public utility. Elsewhere he will  
 say, "that *virtue*, that *honesty*, with regard to individuals,  
 "is no more than the *habit of actions personally advantageous*,  
 "and that *self-interest* is the sole scale by which the actions  
 "of man can be measured." Infine, "that if the virtuous  
 "man is not happy in this world, then will be the time  
 "to cry out, *O Virtue! thou art but an empty dream ‡.*"

The same Sophister also says, that "sublime virtue, en-  
 "lightened wisdom, are only the fruits of those passions called  
 "folly. Or that stupidity is the necessary consequence of  
 "the cessation of passion. That to moderate the passions, is  
 "to ruin the state ||. That *conscience* and *remorse* are nothing  
 "but the *forefigh*t of those physical penalties, to which  
 "crimes expose us. That the man who is above the law, can  
 "commit, without remorse, the dishonest act that may serve  
 "his purpose §." That it *little imports* whether *men are vi-*  
*cious*, if they be but enlightened \*\*.

And the fair sex will be taught by this author, that  
 "MODESTY is only an *invention of refined voluptuousness* :

\* Antiquity Unveiled, page 15.

† Letter of Thrasybulus.

‡ On the Mind. Discourse 2d and 4th.

|| Idem. Discourse 2d and 3d, chap. 6, 7, 8 and 10.

§ Idem. Of Man, vol. 1st, sec. 2d, chap. 7.

\*\* Idem. No. 9, chap. 6.

“ that MORALITY has nothing to apprehend from *love*, for  
 “ it is the passion that *creates genius*, and *renders man virtu-*  
 “ *ous* \*.” He will inform children, that “ the command-  
 “ ment of loving their father and mother, is more the work  
 “ of education than of nature †.” He will say to the married couple, that “ the law which condemns them to  
 “ live together, becomes *barbarous and cruel* on the day they  
 “ cease to love each other ‡.”

In vain should we seek among the other works that the chiefs of the conspirators wished to circulate a more Christian MORALITY. Dumarfais, as well as Helvetius, knows no other virtue but what is *useful*, nor vice but that which is *hurtful* to man upon earth ||. The *Philosophic Soldier*, thinks that so far from being able to offend God, *men are obliged to execute his laws* §. The author of the *Good Sense* so much praised by the leaders, tells them that to think we can offend God, is *to think ourselves stronger than God* \*\*. He would even teach them to answer us, “ If your God leaves  
 “ to men the *liberty of damning themselves*, *why should you*  
 “ *meddle with it* ? Are you *wiser* than that God whose rights  
 “ you wish to *avenge* ††.”

Boulanger, in that work so much admired by Frederick and Voltaire, asserts that the *fear of God*, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, *would rather be the beginning of folly* ††.

It would be useless to the reader, and irksome to us, were we to carry these quotations any farther. Those who wish to see these texts and numberless others of the same kind, may peruse the HELVIAN LETTERS. But certainly there

\* Of the Mind. Dis. 2d, chap. 4 and 15, &c.

† Of Man. Chap. 8.

‡ Ibid. Sect. 8, &c.

|| Essay on Prejudices, chap. 8.

§ Chap. 20.

\*\* Sect. 67.

†† Sect. 135.

†† Christianity un-

veiled, in a note to page 163.

is enough here to demonstrate, that conspirators who wished to circulate such works, were not levelling solely at the Catholic religion, much less at a few abuses. No evidently every altar where Christ was adored, was to be overthrown, whether Anglican, Calvinist or Protestant.

The base project of throwing into circulation four or five thousand copies of John Mellier's Last Will, would fully prove the absolute design of annihilating every vestige of Christianity, since this Last Will or Testament is nothing but a gross declamation against the doctrines of the Gospel.

---

## CHAP. X.

*Of the Spoliations and Violences projected by the Conspirators, and concealed under the Name of Toleration.*

What  
their tole-  
ration  
really was.

PERHAPS of all the arts put in practice by the conspirators, none has succeeded better with them, than that perpetual appeal in all their writings to *toleration, reason, and humanity*; of which Condorcet tells us they had made their *war-boost* \*. In fact it was natural enough, that men who appeared so deeply impressed with these sentiments should gain the attention of the public: But were they real? Did the conspiring Sophisters mean to content themselves with a true toleration? As they acquired strength, did they mean to grant to others what they asked for themselves? These questions are easily solved; and it would be useless for the reader to seek the definition of each of these high-sounding words imposed upon the public, when their private and real sentiments are to be seen in their continued cry of *Crush religion*. To cast an eye on their correspondence, is sufficient to identify the plans of these conspiring So-

\* Sketch on History. Epoch 9.

phisters,

phisters, with those of the Jacobins their successors; do not the Petions, the Condorcets, and the Robespierres, adopt their wishes and execute their plans under the same mask of toleration.

Plunder, violence and death has been the toleration of the revolutionists. Nor were any of these means foreign to the first conspirators, whose language the latter had adopted. As to spoliations, I have already said that Voltaire, as early as the year 1743, was plotting with the King of Prussia to plunder the ecclesiastical princes and the religious orders of their possessions. In 1764, we have seen him sending a memorial to the Duke of Praslin, on the abolition of tythes, in hopes of depriving the clergy of their sustenance\*. In 1770, he had not abandoned his plan when he writes to Frederick, "I wish to God that Ganganelli had some good domain in your neighbourhood, and that you were not so far from Loretto. It is noble to scoff at these Harlequin Bull-givers. I like to cover them with ridicule, but *I had rather PLUNDER them* †."

These various letters prove to the reader, that the chief of the conspirators only anticipated the plundering decrees of the Jacobins, or even the revolutionary incursion their armies have made to Loretto.

\* Let. from Voltaire to the Count D'Argental, 1764.

† 8th June, 1770.

Rejected  
and ap-  
proved by  
Frede-  
rick.

Frederick, assuming the kingly tone, seems for an instant so shocked at these spoliations, as to have forgotten that he had been the first to propose them. He answers, "Were Loretto adjoining to my villa, I should not touch it. Its treasures might tempt a Mandrin, a Conflans, a Turpin, a Rich . . . . or their fellows. It is not that I reverence donations consecrated by sottish stupidity, but what the public venerates is to be spared. When one looks upon one's self, as gifted with superior lights, out of compassion for others, in commiseration for their weakness, one should not shock their prejudices. It is a pity that the pretended philosophers of our days are not of the same way of thinking \*." But soon the Sophister prevails over the monarch, and Frederick is no longer of opinion that spoils of the church are to be left to a Mandrin: the very next year coinciding with Voltaire he writes to him, "If the new minister of France is a man of sense, he will neither be weak nor foolish enough to restore Avignon to the Pope †." He recurs to his means of *silently undermining the edifice*, by first plundering the religious orders, that they might then strip the bishops ‡.

\* Let. 7th July 1770.

† Let 29th June 1771.

‡ 13th Aug, 1775.

D'Alembert,



D'Alembert, on his side advised, that the clergy should be first deprived of that consequence they enjoyed in the state, before they were plundered of their possessions. In sending to Voltaire his task almost ready made, that he might speak out what he dared not utter himself, he tells him, "that he must not forget, if it could be done delicately, to add to the first part a little appendix, or an engaging postscript on the danger there is both for states and kings, to suffer the clergy to form a separate and distinct body, with the privilege of holding regular assemblies \*."

As yet this doctrine was new both to king or state; they had never perceived this pretended danger of letting the clergy form a distinct body in the nation, as did the nobility and the third order; but these conspiring chiefs were anticipating the horrors of the revolution, the plunders and murders of their Jacobin successors and disciples.

The violent and sanguinary edicts, the decrees of deportation and of death, were not foreign to the wishes of the conspiring chiefs. However frequent the words of toleration, humanity or reason, may be in Voltaire's mouth, it would be a great error in judgment to think, that those were the only arms he wished to employ against the Chri-

\* Letter 95, 1773.

stian

stian religion. When he writes to Count Argental, "Had I but a hundred thousand men, I well know what I would do with them\*." Or when he wrote to Frederick, "Hercules went to fight the robbers and Bellerophon chimeras; I should not be sorry to behold Herculefes and Bellerophons delivering the earth both from Catholic robbers and Catholic chimeras†." Doubtless it was not toleration that dictated those wishes, and one is tempted to conclude, that he would not have been sorry to behold the massacre of the clergy, by the Herculefes and Bellerophons of the butchering September. Have we not seen him wishing to behold *every Jesuit at the bottom of the ocean, each with a Jansenist hung to his neck?* When with the view of avenging Helvetius and philosophism, he does not blush to ask, *Could not the moderate and discreet proposal of strangling the last Jesuit with the guts of the last Jansenist, bring matters to some compromise?* In reading this, could we reasonably infer, that the humanity and toleration of Voltaire would have been greatly shocked at the sight of those ships, stowed with the Catholic clergy by a Lebon, as a preparatory step to submerging them in the ocean!!!

Frederick's  
similar  
with.

Frederick seemed to be nearer simple toleration when he answered Voltaire: "It is not the lot of

\* 16th Feb. 1761.

† 3d March, 1767.

" arms

“ arms to destroy the wretch. It will perish by  
 “ those of truth \*.” At length he begins to think  
 that force must strike the last blow at religion.  
 He is not averse to this force, and one sees him  
 willing to employ it had the occasion offered,  
 when he wrote to Voltaire, “ To Bayle, your fore-  
 “ runner, and to yourself no doubt, is due the  
 “ honor of that revolution working in the minds  
 “ of men. But to speak with truth, it is not yet  
 “ complete ; bigots have their party, and *it will*  
 “ *never be perfected but by a superior force : from*  
 “ *government must the sentence issue, that shall crush*  
 “ *the wretch.* Ministers may forward it, *but the*  
 “ *will of the sovereign must accede.* Without doubt  
 “ this will be effectuated in time, but neither of  
 “ us can be spectators of that long-wished for  
 “ moment †.”

There can be no doubt but ~~what~~ ~~that~~ long-  
 fought for moment was that, when impiety en-  
 throned, should cast aside the mask of toleration,  
 which it had necessarily disguised itself with: Ju-  
 lian-like, would not Frederick also have had re-  
 course to superior force at that desired period?  
 would he not have seconded the sophisms of the  
 conspirators with that sentence which was to issue  
 from the sovereign? He would have spoken as a  
 master, and under Frederick might not the reigns

• 25th March, 1767.

† Let. 95, 1775.

of

of a Domitian or a Julian have been renewed, when apostacy, exile or death, were the only alternatives left to a Christian's choice. But how to reconcile this superior force, this sentence of the government, that is *to crush*, with what D'Alembert says of that prince in a letter to Voltaire, is difficult: "I believe him at his last shift, and it is a great pity. Philosophy will not easily find like him a prince, tolerant through indifference, which is the true style, and an enemy to superstition and fanaticism \*."

The  
frantic  
with of  
D'Alem-  
bert.

But with D'Alembert even that mode of tolerating, through indifference, did not exclude underhand persecutions; nor would it have been incompatible with this man's rage and phrenzy, so openly expressed in his letters to Voltaire, to see a whole nation destroyed solely for having shewn its attachment to Christianity. Could toleration, through indifference, dictate the following lines? "Apropos of the King of Prussia, he has at length got a-head again. And I, as a Frenchman and a thinking being, am quite of your opinion, that it is a great happiness both for France and for philosophy. Those Austrians are a set of insolent capuchines who hate and despise us, and whom I could wish to see annihilated with the superstition they protect †."

\* Letter 195, an. 1762. † To Voltaire, 12th Jan. 1763.

It

It would be useless to remark in this place, that these very Austrians which D'Alembert wishes to see annihilated, were then the allies of France, at war with that very King of Prussia whose victories he celebrates. These circumstances might serve to show, how much more philosophism swayed the heart of the Sophister than the love of his country, or that toleration would not have hindered the conspirators from betraying their king or country, could they by that have made a new attack on Christianity.

We plainly see that all these inhuman wishes were rather dropped unawares, than the avowed object of their correspondence. They were preparing the road for those seditious and ferocious minds, who were to perpetrate what the Sophisters yet could only devise and scheme. The day of rebellion and murder was not yet come, with the same wishes circumstances had not distributed to them the same parts to act. Let us then examine what characters the first chiefs performed, and by what services each one in particular, signaling his zeal in the Antichristian Conspiracy, prepared the reign of their revolutionary adepts.

## CHAP.

## CHAP. XI.

*Part, Mission and private Means of each of the  
Chiefs of the Antichristian Conspiracy.*

Vol-  
taire's  
services:

his ardor:

IN order to attain the grand object of the conspiracy, in short to crush the Christ whom they pursued with unrelenting hatred, all the general plans and means they had concerted were judged insufficient. Each one in particular was to concur with his own means, with those which his faculties, his situation or peculiar mission enabled him to exert. Voltaire was endowed with all those talents which adorn the eminent writer, and no sooner was the confederacy formed than he turned them all against his God. During the last five and twenty years of his life he declares himself, that *he had no other object in view than to vilify the wretch\**. Until that period, he had shared his time between poetry and impiety, but henceforward he is solely impious. One might have thought that he alone wished to vomit forth more blasphemies and calumnies against the God of Christianity, than had done the whole class of Celsi,

\* Letter to Damilaville, 15th June 1762.

or

or Porphyrii during all ages. In the numerous collection of his works more than forty volumes in 8vo, Romances, Dictionaries, Histories, Memoirs, Letters or Commentaries, flowed from his pen, imbibed with rage and the wish of crushing Christ.

In this immense collection it would be in vain to seek any particular system of Deism, of Materialism or Scepticism. They all form one common mass. We have seen him conjuring D'Alembert to unite all these diverging sects in the common attack against Christ, and his own heart may be said to have been their focus. He cared not from whence arose the storm, or whose the hand that struck, for the subversion of the altar was his only aim. The religious authors and we ourselves, have shown him fickle in his systems and daily adopting new opinions, and that from his own works\*; one beheld twenty different men in him alone, but each of them equally hateful. Rage accounts for his contradictions; his hypocrisy even flows from the same source. This latter phenomenon is not sufficiently known, it must have its page in history; but let Voltaire himself speak as to the extent and original cause of so base a conduct.

During that inundation of Antichristian books of his in France, government would sometimes, though  
Of his hypocrisy and communions.  
 \* See the Helvian Letters, and particularly letter 34 and 42. remissly,

remissly, take cognizance of their authors. Voltaire himself had been prosecuted, on account of his first impious writings. When declared premier chief, he thought that more caution became his pre-eminence, lest any legal proof should be acquired of his impiety. The better to attack, and the more securely to *crush Christ*, he conceals himself under his very banners; frequenting his temples, being present at his mysteries, receiving into his mouth the God he blasphemed: and if annually at Easter he received, it was but to blaspheme his God more audaciously. To so monstrous an accusation, uncontestable proofs must be brought.

On the 15th of Jan. 1761, Voltaire sends a performance, I know not what, but which the editor of his works supposes to be an epistle to Mademoiselle Clairon a famous actress in those days, to one of his female adepts, the Countess of Argental, whom he styles his angel. Beyond a doubt it was a most scandalous production, since only the chosen of the elect are favored with it, or rather that Voltaire *dares* send it to. In fine, whatever was the subject, it was accompanied with the following letter.

“ Will you amuse yourself with the perusal  
 “ of this scrap: will you read it to Mademoiselle  
 “ Clairon? None but yourself and the Duke de  
 “ Choiseul are in possession of it: you will pre-  
 “ sently tell me that I grow very daring and  
 “ rather



“ rather wicked in my old age : wicked ! No,  
 “ I turn Minos, I judge the perverse. But take care  
 “ of yourself. There are people who do not for-  
 “ give.—I know it, and I am like them. I am  
 “ now sixty-seven years old, I go to the parochial  
 “ mass. I edify my people. I am building a  
 “ church, *I receive communion*, and I will be buried  
 “ there, zounds, in spite of all the hypocrites.  
 “ I believe in Jesus Christ consubstantial with  
 “ God, in the Virgin Mary mother of God.—Ye  
 “ base persecutors what have you to say to me.—  
 “ But you have written the Pucelle—No, I never  
 “ did.—It is you who are the author of it, it was  
 “ you gave ears to Joan’s palfrey.—I am a good  
 “ Christian, a faithful servant of the king, a good  
 “ lord of the parish and a proper tutor for a daughter.  
 “ I make curates and Jesuits tremble. I do what I  
 “ please with my little province as big as the palm of  
 “ my hand (his estate extended about six miles);  
 “ I am a man to dispose of the Pope whenever  
 “ I please.—Well, ye raggamuffins, what have  
 “ you to say to me.—These, my dear angels, are  
 “ the answers, I would make to the Fantins,  
 “ Grisels, Guyons or to the little black mon-  
 “ key, &c. &c.”

The female adepts might laugh at the tone and  
 style of such a letter, but will the judicious reader  
 see it in any other light, than as the production of  
 an insolent old man, who proud of his protections

VOL. I.

M

is

is nevertheless determined to impudently lie, and to set forth the most orthodox profession of faith, should the religious authors accuse him of impiety, to combat the laws with denials or his sacrilegious *communions*; and the infidel talks of hypocrites and base cowards!

Such odious artifice seems to have shocked the Count D'Argental himself, for on the 16th of January following, Voltaire writes to him, "That  
 " had he a hundred thousand men he knows what  
 " use he would make of them; but as I have them  
 " not, *I will receive at Easter*, and you may call  
 " *me hypocrite as much as you please*; yes by God,  
 " I will receive the sacrament, and that in com-  
 " pany with Mad. Denis and Mademoiselle Cor-  
 " neille, and if you say much, I will put the *Tan-*  
 " *tum ergo* into verse and that in cross rhimes."

It appears that many more of the adepts were ashamed of this meanness in their chief. He at length thinks himself bound to write to D'Alembert on the subject, and tells him, " I know  
 " there are people who speak ill of my Easter  
 " devotions. It is a penance I must resign my-  
 " self to, in expiation of my sins.—*Yes, I have*  
 " *received my Easter communion, and what is more,*  
 " *I presented in person, the hallowed bread*; after  
 " this, I could boldly defy both Molinists and  
 " Jansenists \*."

\* 27th of April 1768.

If

If these last words do not sufficiently declare the motives of his hypocrisy, the following letter, again to D'Alembert, will do away all doubt. It is only three days posterior to the last. "In your opinion, what are the fates to do when they are surrounded by senseless barbarians? There are times when *one must imitate their distortions and speak their language. Mutemur clypeos* (let us change our bucklers). In fine, what I have done this year, *I have already done several times*, and please God I will do it again \*." This is the same letter in which he particularly recommends that *the mysteries of Mytra should not be divulged*, and concludes it with this terrible sentence against Christianity, *For the monster must fall pierced by a hundred invincible bands; yes, let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows.*

With this profound dissimulation †, Voltaire combined all that dark-dealing activity, which the oath

\* 1st of May 1768.

† If I am to credit men who knew Voltaire in the earlier part of his literary triumphs, he was then no stranger to this profound hypocrisy. The following is an anecdote I learned of men who knew him well. By one of those fantastical chances, Voltaire had a brother, an arrant Jansenist, professing all that austerity of manners which that sect affected. The Abbé Arouet heir to a considerable fortune would not see his impious brother, and openly said that he would not leave him a halfpenny. But his health was weak, and his

His pref-  
fing ex-  
hortations  
to the  
adepts.

oath of crushing the God of Christianity could suggest to the premier chief of the Antichristian Sophisters. Not content with his partial attacks, he had recourse to whole legions of adepts from the east to the west; he encouraged them, he pressed and stimulated them in this warfare. Present every where by his correspondence, he would write to one, "Prevail on all the brethren, "to pursue *the wretch in their discourses and in their writings, without allowing him one moment's respite.*" To another he would say, "*make as much as possible, the most prudent efforts to crush the wretch.*" Should he observe any of the adepts less ardent than himself, he would extend his Philippics to all: "*They forget (says he) that the most material occupation ought to be to crush*

life could be of no long duration, Voltaire had not given up all hopes of the inheritance; he turns Jansenist and acts the devotee; on a sudden he appears in the Jansenistical garb, with a large slouched hat, he runs from church to church. He took care to choose the same hours as the Abbé Arouet, and there with a deportment as contrite and humble as Deacon Paris himself, kneeling in the middle of the church, or standing with his arms crossed on his breast, his eyes cast on the ground, on the altar or on the Christian orator, he would hearken or pray with all the compunction of the penitent sinner reclaimed from his errors. The Abbé believed in his brother's conversion, exhorted him to persevere and died leaving him all his fortune. But the Jansenist's cash was all that Voltaire retained of his conversion.

" *the*

"*the monster* \*." The reader has not forgotten that monster, wretch and Christ or religion, are synonymous in his mouth. Satan could not have been more ardent, when, in the war of hell against heaven, he fought to stir up his legions against the Word; he could not more urgently exclaim, we must triumph over the Word or meanly serve: shame in defeat, could not be expressed more forcibly by Satan than by Voltaire, when he cries out to his adepts, "*Such is our position, that we shall be the execration of mankind, if (in this war against Christ) we have not the better sort of people on our side; we must therefore gain them cost what it will; crush the wretch, I tell you, then crush the wretch †.*"

So much zeal had made him the idol of the party. The adepts flocked from all parts to see him, and went away fired with his rage. Those who could not approach him, consulted him, laid their doubts before him; would crave to know whether there really was a God, if they really had a soul. Voltaire, who knew nothing of the matter, smiled at his own power, but always answered that the God of the Christians was to be crushed. Such were the letters he received every week ‡.

His correspondence.

\* See letters to Thiriot, Saurin and Damienville.

† Let. to D'Alembert, 129.

‡ Voltaire's let. to Mad. du Deffant, 22d July 1761.

He wrote himself a prodigious number in the same blasphemous style. One must have seen the collection, to believe that the heart or hatred of one single man could dictate, or that his hand could pen them, and that without alluding to his many other blasphemous works. In his den at Ferney, he would be informed of, and see all; he would even direct every thing that related to the conspiracy. Kings, princes, dukes, marquisses, petty authors or citizens, might write to him, provided they were but impious. He would answer them all, strengthen them, and encourage them in their impiety. In fine, to his extreme old age, his life was that of a legion of devils, whose sole and continued object, was to crush Christ and overthrow his altar.

Frederick's services.

Frederick the Sophister, though on a throne, was not less active, nor less astonishing for his activity. This man, who alone did for his states all that a king could do, and more even than both king and ministers in most other countries do, out-stripped the Sophisters also, in their Antichristian deeds. As a chief of the conspiracy, his part, or folly, was to see and protect the inferior adepts, if any of them chanced to fall Victims to what was called fanaticism. When the Abbé Desprades was obliged to fly the censures of the Sorbonne and the decrees of the parliament, the sophistical monarch presents him with a canonicate at Breslaw.

flaw \*. A hair-brained youth flies the vengeance of the laws, after having broken the public monuments of religion, he is received, and the colours of a regiment are entrusted to his hands †. His treasures are exhausted for his armies, but not so for the adepts. In the very height of war, their pensions, and particularly D'Alembert's, are regularly paid.

He was sometimes seen to lay aside the Sophister, and think it beneath a monarch to be connected with a set of *blackguards, coxcombs and visionary fools* ‡. But those were little sallies which the Sophisters easily overlooked; his philosophism would return, he was one of their's again, and his hatred to Christianity would once more engage his whole attention. He would then spur on Voltaire himself; he would urge and solicit him impatiently for new writings, and the more impious the work, the more he approved of it. Then with Voltaire and D'Alembert, he would demean himself even to their artifices; he would above all admire the hand that struck unseen, or as he expresses himself, that method of filliping the *wretch*, while loading him with civilities §.

Then assuming the character of base flattery, he would style Voltaire the God of Philosophy.

\* Voltaire to D'Alembert, 2 and 3.

† Ibid, 211.

‡ His Dialogues of the Dead.

§ 16 March 1771.

“ He would figure him ascending Olympus,  
 “ loaded and satiated with glory, *the conqueror of*  
 “ *the wretch*, supported by the genii of Lu-  
 “ cretius and Sophocles, of Virgil and Locke,  
 “ seated on a car beaming with light, and placed  
 “ between Newton and Epicurus \*.” He paid  
 homage to him for the Antichristian revolution,  
 which he saw preparing †. Unable to triumph  
 by so many titles himself, he would acquire that of  
 being laborious, and all those impious works, whe-  
 ther in rhyme or in prose, and published under his  
 name, are not the only productions of the royal  
 Sophister. Many are those which he privately  
 ushered into circulation, and which never could  
 have been thought to be those of a man who had  
 the duties of the throne to fulfil. Such, for exam-  
 ple, that extract of Bayle, more impious than  
 Bayle himself; he only rejects the useless articles,  
 in order to condense the poison of the rest. His  
*Akasia*, and that *Discourse on the History of the*  
*Church*, so much extolled as well as its preface, by  
 the abettors of impiety. Infine, such were his num-  
 berless productions, in which Voltaire finds no  
 other fault but the eternal repetitions (like his  
 own), of the same arguments against religion ‡.

\* 25th Nov. 1766.

† Let. 154, anno 1767.

‡ Correspondence of Voltaire and King of Prussia, let.  
 133, 151, 159, &c. &c.

Hence



Hence we see that it was not enough for Frederick to forward the conspiracy by his counsels ; to give refuge to its agents ; but he would also, by his constancy and application to infect Europe with his impieties, attain to the rank of chief. If he was inferior to Voltaire, it was by his talents, and not from his hatred ; but had Voltaire been destitute of the support of a Frederick, he could not have risen to the height he did. Possessed of the secret, he would willingly have initiated all kings to the mysteries of the conspiracy, and of all, he was the king who gave it the chief support. His example was still more powerful than his writings, and it may be justly said that, his reign was that of the sceptered infidel.

Placed in an humbler sphere, Diderot and Diderot's  
D'Alembert began their mission, or parts, by a <sup>services.</sup>  
game, which well characterized their apostleship. Both were already actuated by its zeal, but neither had yet acquired that reputation which they afterwards gained, more by their impiety, than by their abilities. The coffee-houses of Paris were their first stage. There unknown, first in one then in another, they would begin an argument on religious matters, Diderot the assailant and D'Alembert the defendant. The objection was forcible and pointed, the energy and tone of Diderot was invincible. The reply was weak, but made with all the apparent candour of a Christian, who  
wished

wished to maintain the honor and truth of his religion. The idle Parisians, who generally resorted to these places, would hearken or admire, and sometimes take a part in the dispute. Diderot then insisted, resumed and pressed the argument. D'Alembert in return, owned that the difficulty appeared unanswerable, and then withdrew as if ashamed, and regretting, that neither his divinity, nor his love for religion, could furnish him with arguments for its defence. Soon after our two friends would meet to felicitate each other on the good success of their sham conflict, and on the impression they had made upon the croud of ignorant hearers, who had been completely duped. They made a fresh appointment; the dispute was taken up again, the hypocritical advocate for religion, makes a new display of his zeal, but submits to the superior arguments of Atheism. At length the police, informed of their game, attempted to put a stop to it: but it was too late; these sophisms had spread through the different societies, never more to be eradicated. Hence arose, in great part, that fury which soon became fashionable, with all the youth of Paris, of disputing on matters of faith, and that still greater folly of looking on objections as insuperable, which immediately disappear when in search of truth, we seek to know it, and follow it in spite of those passions which militate against it. It was on this occasion, of the  
coffee-

coffee-house disputations, that the lieutenant of the police, upbraiding Diderot with propagating Atheism, that madman proudly answered, *It is true, I am an Atheist, and I glory in it.* Why Sir, replied the minister, you would know, were you in my place, that had no God existed, it would be necessary to have invented one.

However much the brain of this Atheist might have been heated, the fear of the Bastille put a period to his apostleship. The minister would have been more correct in his office, had he threatened him with Bedlam. We refer the reader to the Helvian Letters, where are recorded his numberless titles to a place there\*. He was in reality the boasting madman of the conspiracy. They wanted a man of this cast, who would utter all the absurd and contradictory impieties which his brain could invent. Such are those ideas with which he filled his different writings, his pretended *Philosophic Thoughts*, his *Letter to the Blind*, his *Code* and his *System of Nature*.

This last work gave great offence to Frederick, who even refuted it, for reasons we shall explain in the Antimonarchial Conspiracy. And indeed D'Alembert always kept the authors name a profound secret. He would not even own it to Vol-

\* Let. 57 and 58.

taire,

taire, though he was as well acquainted with it as myself. Diderot, was not the sole author of this famous system. To build this chaos of nature, which destitute of *intelligence*, had made man intelligent, he had associated with two other Sophisters, whose names I will not hazard, for fear of error, not paying sufficient attention to them to be certain; but as to Diderot, I am sure, being previously acquainted with him. It was he who sold the manuscript, to be printed out of France, for the sum of one thousand livres. I know the fact from the man who paid them and owned it, when he had learned to better know those impious Sophisters.

Notwithstanding all these follies, Diderot, was not the less, in Voltaire's eyes, the *illustrious philosopher, the brave Diderot*, and one of the most useful *knights* of the conspiracy\*. The conspirators proclaimed him the *Great Man*; they sent him to foreign courts as the *Admirable Man*; and when he had been guilty of some notable piece of folly, they were silent, or even disowned him. This was the case in particular, when at the court of the Empress of Russia.

Formerly at all courts, a fool was kept for their amusement; fashion had substituted a French phi-

\* Let. from Voltaire to Diderot, 25th of Dec. 1761, and to Damilaville, 1765, &c.

osopher,

lofopher, and little had been gained in point of common fenfe. But the Empreſs Catherine, ſoon perceived that much might be loſt with reſpect to public tranquillity. She had ſent for Diderot, ſhe judged his *imagination to be inexhaufible*. She claſſed him *among the moſt extraordinary men that ever exiſted* \*. She was correct in her judgement, for Diderot behaved himſelf in ſuch an extraordinary manner, that her majeſty thought it neceſſary to ſend him back to the place he came from. He comforted himſelf for his diſgrace, with the idea that the Ruſſians were not yet ripe for the ſublimity of his philoſophy. He ſets off for Paris in a bannian, with a velvet cap on his head. His footman, like a king at arms preceded, and when they were to paſs through any town or village, he would cry out to the gazing multitude, it is Diderot the great man that paſſes †. Such was his equipage from Petersburg to Paris. There he was, to ſupport the character of the extraordinary man, whether writing in his ſtudy, or dealing out in divers companies, his philoſophic abſurdities; always the boſom friend of D'Alembert, and the admiration of the other Sophiſters. He finiſhed his apoſtleſhip by *his Life of Seneca*, in which he ſees no other difference between him and his dog

\* Catherine to Voltaire, let. 134, anno 1774.

† Feller's Historical Dictionary.

but

but that of their dress : and by his *New Philosophical Thoughts*, where God is supposed to be the *Animal Prototype*, and mortals so many little particles flowing from this great animal, and successively metamorphosed into all sorts of animals until the end of time, whence they are all to return to the divine substance, whence they had originally emanated\*.

Diderot would madly utter all those absurdities, which Voltaire would impiously assert. None gained credit it is true, but religious truths were enfeebled by these assertions wrapped in frothy discourse and philosophic pomp. Men ceased to believe the religion of Christ, ever reviled in these writings, and that was all the Sophisters aimed at. Hence was the part which Diderot acted, so essential to the conspiracy.

Who can combine this antichristian zeal, ever boiling ever emphatic when his imagination is heated, with that real admiration which he often expressed for the Gospel. The following is an anecdote I had from Mr. Beauzet, a member of the academy. One day going to see Diderot, he found him explaining a chapter of the Gospel to his daughter, as seriously and with the concern of the most Christian parent. Mr. Beauzet expressed his surprize. " I understand you, said Diderot,

\* *New Philosophical Thoughts*, page 17 and 18. The whole is exposed in the *Helvian Letters*, No. 49.

" but

"but in truth where could I find, or what better lessons could I give her?"

D'Alembert would never have made such an avowal. Though the constant friend of Diderot we find throughout their lives, and their philosophic course, that same difference which marked their first essays in the apostleship. Diderot spoke out whatever he thought for the moment, D'Alembert never but what he wished to say. I will defy any one to find his real opinion on God or on the *soul*, elsewhere than in his private correspondence with the conspirators. His works have all the darkness and cunning of iniquity, but he is the fox that infects and then burrows himself. Easier would it be to follow the twistings of the eel, or trace the windings of the serpent gliding through the grass, than the tortuous course he follows in those writings which he *owns* \*.

D'Alembert's services.

Nobody

\* From the criticism made of his works in our Helvian Letters; the result is this: D'Alembert will never declare himself a sceptic, or whether he knows of the existence of a God or not. He will even let you think that he believes in God; but will begin by attacking certain proofs of a Deity; he will tell you that through zeal for the Deity, man must know how to choose among those proofs. He will end by attacking them all, with a *yes* on one object, and a *no* a little later on the same; he will entangle the minds of his readers, he will raise doubts in them, and smile to see them fallen without

Nobody was ever more true to Voltaire's maxim of *strike, but hide your hand*. The avowal he makes of his *bows* to religion, while he is striving to pull it to pieces \*, might dispense the historian from seeking those numerous proofs with which the works of this Sophister abound. To make himself amends for this perpetual restraint under which, from his dissimulation, he was forced himself to write, by means of his pupils or in their productions he would speak more

without perceiving it, into the very snare he had prepared for them. He never tells you to attack religion, but he will tempt you with a stand of arms, or place them in your hands ready for combat. (*See his Elements of Philosophy and our Helvian Letters, No. 37.*) He will never declaim against the morality of the church or the commandments of God, but he will tell you that *there does not exist a single catechism on morality, fitted to the capacities of youth*; and that it is to be hoped there will at length appear a Philosopher who will confer that gift (*See Elem. of Phil. No. 12.*). He will not pretend to deny the sweets of virtue, but he will tell you, "that all philosophers would have better known our nature, had they been satisfied with simply confining the happiness of this life to the exemption from pain." (*Preface of the Encyclopedia*). He will not offend his reader by obscene descriptions, but he will tell him, ART. HAPPINESS, "Men all agree as to the nature of happiness; they declare it to be the same as pleasure, or at least that they are indebted to pleasure for all that is most delicious in it." And thus his young pupil is transformed into an Epicurean without knowing it.

\* Let. to Voltaire, No. 151.

daringly



daringly. When he returned them their works, he would artfully insinuate an article or plan a preface, but so much the worse for the pupil, if he underwent the punishment incurred by the master. Morellet, as yet a youth, though already a graduate among the divines of the Encyclopedia, had just published his first essay in philosophism. This was a manual with which Voltaire was enchanted; above all he valued the Preface, *it was one of the finest lashes ever given by Protagoras*. The youth was taken up and sent to the Bastille. The real Protagoras or D'Alembert, who had so well taught him the art of *lashing*, never owned the whip, as may be supposed\*.

On the whole, D'Alembert would have been but of little use to the conspirators, had he confined himself to his pen. In spite of his quibbling style and of his epigrams, his talent of wearying his readers left them an antidote. Voltaire, by giving him another mission suited his genius better. He had reserved to himself the ministers, <sup>is charged with training youth.</sup> dukes, princes and kings, and all those sufficiently initiated to forward the conspiracy. But charged D'Alembert, with the care of training the young adepts: "*Endeavour*," he writes expressly,

\* Letter from D'Alembert to Voltaire, anno 1760, and of Voltaire to Thiriot, 26th Jan. 1762.

*" endeavour on your part, to enlighten youth as much  
" as you are able \*."*

Never was mission more actively, more zealously, nor more ably fulfilled. It is even to be remarked, that however hidden D'Alembert may have been in all the other parts he acted in the conspiracy, he was not averse to having his zeal in this particular rather observed. He was the general protector of all young men who came to Paris possessed of any talent. Had they any fortune of their own, he dazzled them with crowns, premiums, or even with the academic seats, of which he absolutely disposed, either as perpetual secretary, or as irresistible in all those petty intrigues wherein he so much excelled. The reader has already seen what a party-stroke it was for the conspirators, to have filled this tribunal of European Mandarines presiding over the empire of letters, with their adepts. But his power in this extended far beyond Paris. He writes to Voltaire, " I have just got Helvetius and the Chevalier de Jean-  
" court, admitted into the academy at Berlin."

D'Alembert was particularly attentive to such of the adepts as were intended to train others, or to fulfil the functions of private or public professors, or of tutors in private families; but particularly in the latter, when the pupil, by his rank or wealth,

\* 15th Sep. 1762.

could

could hereafter be a protector of the conspirators, or more amply remunerate his teacher. This was the true method of imbibing youth with the real principles of the conspiracy. D'Alembert was perfectly aware of its importance, and judged his means so well that he succeeded in spreading such tutors and preceptors, throughout all the countries of Europe, and deserved the title of the most fortunate propagator of philosophism.

The proofs he cites of their progress, will suffice to show the choice he had made. "There is  
 " my dear philosopher, he exultingly writes to  
 " Voltaire, there is what was pronounced at Cassel on the 8th of April, in presence of his highness the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, of six  
 " princes of the empire and of a most numerous  
 " assembly by a professor of history which I gave to  
 " his Highness the Landgrave." This was a discourse full of the grossest invectives against the church and the clergy as *obscure fanatics, ye prayers crossed or unmitred, with or without a cowl*; and such was the style of the professor, such the proofs adduced by D'Alembert of the victories daily gained by his adepts over religious ideas, and of the sentiments they instilled into their pupils\*.

It imported above all to the conspirators to place such tutors about young princes and children

\* Letter 78, anno 1772.

hereafter destined to govern nations. The correspondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert lays open their intrigues on this point, and what powerful support they expected from it.

The court of Parma was seeking men worthy of presiding over the education of the young Infant. In placing the Abbés de Condilhac and de Leire at the head of his instructors they flattered themselves with having succeeded, as they little thought that these two men were to inspire the young prince with the irreligious ideas of the Sophisters. The Abbé de Condilhac in particular, had by no means the reputation of an Encyclopedian philosopher. It was even late when they became sensible of their error, which could only be remedied by the total subversion of all that these two tutors had done. The whole would have been foreseen, had they known that Condilhac was the particular friend of D'Alembert, who always looked up to him as a man precious to the self-created philosophers, or had they known that the choice of these two men, was only the effect of an intrigue in which Voltaire glories; when he writes to D'Alembert, "It appears to me that the Parmesan child will be well surrounded. He will have a Condilhac and a de Leire. If with all that he is a bigot, grace must be powerful indeed \*."

\* Let. from Voltaire to D'Alembert, No. 77, and from D'Alembert, No. 151.

These

These wishes and artifices of the sect were so well handed down, that in spite of Louis the XVIth's attachment to religion, they sought to place new Condilhacs about the heir to the crown; they succeeded in discarding every bishop from the education of the young Dauphin, they would have willingly excluded all ecclesiastics; but despairing of so complete a success, they sought to make the choice fall on some clergyman, who, like Condilhac, would inspire the illustrious pupil with all the principles of the Sophisters. I am acquainted with one of those men whom they dared to tamper with. They offered him the place of tutor to the Dauphin, being, as they said, sure of getting it for him, and of thereby making his fortune; *but on condition* that when he taught the young prince his Catechism, he would take care to insinuate, that all religious doctrine, as well as all the mysteries of Christianity were only prejudices and popular errors, which a prince should be informed of, but never credit; and that in his private lessons he would instil, as true doctrine, all the errors of philosophism. Fortunately this priest answered, that he knew not how to sacrifice his duty to his fortune; more fortunately still Louis XVI. was not a man to encourage such intrigues. The Duke D'Harcourt, named to preside at the education of the Dauphin, took the advice of some bishops, and chose, to read lectures on religion to his pupil, a clergyman perfectly

fectly competent to the task, as he was then superior of the College of La Fleche. Alas! why must we felicitate this tender youth on his death though premature. When the Sophisters of incredulity could not yet flatter themselves with the subversion of the throne of his ancestors, were they not infusing their poisons to transform him at least into an impious king. And when the throne was overturned, would he, more than his young brother, have escaped the hands of the Sophisters of rebellion.

Many other adepts, with the same zeal to en-throne philosophism and to prepare the way for the Antichristian Revolution, in divers other courts, showed the same activity. At Petersburg they had beset the Empress; they had persuaded her that some Sophister, and that of the first class, ought to be entrusted with the education of her son. D'Alembert was named, and the Count Schouvallov is ordered by his sovereign to make the proposal in her name. D'Alembert simply received the offer as a proof *that Voltaire had no reason to be displeased with his mission, and that philosophy was sensibly reaching the throne* \*. Whatever advantages he might have expected to reap from such a commission, he prudently declined; he preferred the petty empire he swayed in Paris, as chief of the adepts, to the precarious favor of

\* Let. 106 and 107, anno 1762.

courts,

courts, and of that in particular whose distance from the center of the conspiracy, could not have permitted him to act the same part in it.

King of the young adepts, he did not confine his protection to those of Paris alone, but to the remotest parts of Russia would he extend his paternal care ; he would follow their progress, their destiny, or protect them in adversity. When he found his power insufficient, he would have recourse to Voltaire's credit; he would write, for instance : " The poor Bertrand is not lucky. He " had petitioned fair Kate (the Empress of Russia) to restore to liberty five or six giddy-headed " Velches. He had conjured her, in the name " of philosophy ; he had drawn up, under that " sacred name, the most eloquent pleading that from " memory of monkey was ever made, and Kate " pretends not to understand it \*." This was as much as to say to Voltaire, try in your turn whether you can succeed better, and do for them what you have so often done for other adepts whose misfortunes I have made known to you.

This understanding equally subsisted in all that regarded the conspiracy ; little satisfied with pointing out works that were to be refuted, or with giving the sketch of some new impious work, he would also be the spy over every religious author. It has often been an object of surprise, to

How he serves Voltaire as a spy.

\* Letter 88, anno 1773.

see Voltaire, so familiar with the anecdotes of the private lives of those whose works he pretended to refute, though generally they are slanderous, sometimes ridiculous, but always foreign to the question. He was indebted to D'Alembert for them. Whether true or false, the latter always chose such as could attach ridicule to the person of the authors, knowing how well Voltaire could substitute ridicule for proof, or for sound argument. Those who doubt of this fact, may consult D'Alembert's letters on the Pere Bertier, or the Abbé Guenée, whom Voltaire, himself, could not but admire, or in those concerning Messrs. le Franc, Caveirac or Sabbatier, and on many others whom Voltaire hardly ever combats, but with the weapons D'Alembert had furnished him with.

His petty  
societies  
and clubs.

On his side Voltaire spared nothing which could raise the consideration of D'Alembert. He would recommend him to all his friends; he would introduce him into every little society, or petty philosophic club, for these were already forming in Paris, to be one day absorbed by the great club of the Jacobins. Some indeed would have been styled aristocratical, as they were the weekly meetings of *counts, marquisses or chevaliers*, personages already too consequential to bend their knee before the altar of their God. Here would they debate on prejudices, superstition or fanaticism. They would scoff at I. C. and his priests,

or



or smile at the simplicity of the adoring populace. They also thought of shaking off the yoke of religion, leaving indeed, just what was necessary to keep the rabble in awe. The female adept, the Countess du Deffant held the chair, and continued her philosophic education under the particular direction of Voltaire, by whose orders she studied Rabelais, Polymbrock, Hume, the Tale of the Tub, and such like romances\*.

D'Alembert was far from being at his ease in these aristocratical clubs, he even disliked this female adept. Voltaire on the contrary, knowing what advantages were to be drawn from them, wished him to belong to them all, and would introduce him by his letters. His introduction was less difficult into some other clubs, and particularly into that where Mad. Necker presided, when she had snatched the sceptre of philosophy from the hands of all the other adepts of her sex†.

Our two chiefs, mutually helped each other by imparting their plans for drawing off the people from their religion. One, in particular, most certainly cannot be omitted in these memoirs, it denotes too well, the intentions of the conspirators,

His plan for rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem.

\* Letters of Voltaire to Mad. Deffant, particularly 13th Oct. 1759.

† See the correspondence of D'Alembert, let. 77, and following of Voltaire to Mad. Fontaine, 8th Feb. 1762, to D'Alembert, No. 31, anno 1770.

it

it shows how far their views extended. It is true, that it was not the invention of D'Alembert, but he was aware of the advantages philosophism would derive from it, and however strange the plan, he flattered himself with the execution of it.

It is well known what strength the Christian religion draws from the fulfilling of the prophecies, and particularly from those of Daniel and of Christ himself, on the fate of the Jews and of their temple. Julian the apostate, in order to give the lie to Christ and to the prophet Daniel, had sought to rebuild the temple. It is also known that flames, bursting forth from the earth, at divers times and devouring the workmen, had obliged him to desist from the undertaking. D'Alembert was not ignorant of this act of the divine vengeance, having been ascertained by a multitude of eye witnesses. He had undoubtedly seen it recorded in Ammianus Marcellinus; an author of unquestionable authority, for he was a friend of Julian, and a Pagan like him. But this did not hinder him from writing to Voltaire, "You probably know, that at this  
" present time, there is at Berlin, one of the cir-  
" cumcised, who expecting Mahomet's paradise,  
" is in the mean time, gone to wait on your for-  
" mer disciple, in the name of the Sultan Musta-  
" pha. In writing to that country the other day,  
" I mentioned, that if the king would but just say  
" a word,

“ a word, it would be a fine opportunity to have  
 “ the temple of Jerusalem rebuilt \*.”

That word was not said by the former disciple, and D'Alembert gives the following reason to Voltaire. “ I have no doubt but that we should  
 “ have succeeded in our negotiation on the re-edi-  
 “ fication of the temple of the Jews, if your  
 “ former disciple had not been afraid of losing  
 “ some circumcised worthies, who would have  
 “ carried away thirty or forty millions with  
 “ them †.” Thus in spite of all their inclination to give the lie to the God of the Christians, even to the fordid interest of the conspirators, was to add a new proof to his doctrines.

Eighteen years after Voltaire had not given up the plan, nor lost all hopes of accomplishing it. Seeing that D'Alembert had not succeeded with Frederick, he endeavoured to prevail with the Empress of Russia. He writes to her, “ If your  
 “ Majesty is in a regular correspondence with Aly  
 “ Bey, I implore your protection with him ; I  
 “ have a little favor to ask of him, it is to rebuild  
 “ the temple of Jerusalem, to recal the Jews, who  
 “ will pay him a large tribute, and thereby make a  
 “ mighty lord of him ‡.”

Voltaire was nearly eighty when he still persisted in this plan, by which he was to prove to

\* 18th Dec. 1763.

† 29th Dec. 1763.

‡ 6th July 1771.

the

the people, that Christ and his prophets, were impostors. Frederick and D'Alembert, were also far advanced in their career, and the time was not far off, when they were to appear before that very God whom they had daringly styled wretch, and against whom they had never ceased to conspire.

I have now laid before my readers, the means, the constancy with which they sought to overturn the altars, to annihilate the dominion of the faith, to destroy the priests of that God, and to substitute the hatred and ignominy of him whom the Christians adore, to his religion. I had promised not so much the history, as the real demonstration of the conspiracy; and whether as to its object, its extent, or its means, I have not resorted to hearsay or vague report, for proof. My proofs are their own; the <sup>comparisons</sup> ~~approximation~~ of their letters, of their mutual communications, carries conviction. My readers may henceforth reconcile this conspiracy, and its means, with that revolution operated by the Jacobins. They may already perceive, that the latter, in destroying the altars of Christ, only execute the plots of the Sophisters, their fore-runners and masters.

Was there a temple to be overthrown, a depre-datory decree against the church, to be passed by the Jacobins, of which we have not already seen the plan! Are not the Marats and the Robespierres, figured by Voltaire in his Hercules and Belle-

Bellerophon? Or where whole nations are to be crushed in hatred to Christianity, have we not seen the wish formally expressed by D'Alembert? Every thing teaches us, the hatred of the father gaining strength in the breast of the son, and the plots propagating, that when force shall coalesce with impiety they can only generate a race brutal and ferocious.

But this force to be acquired by the conspirators supposes a successive progress. Before it could throw off the mask, it was requisite that the number of the adepts should be augmented, and that the arms of the multitude should be secured to them. I am about to show their successes under the reign of corruption, in the divers orders of society, during the lives of the chiefs. Hence history will hereafter more easily conceive and explain what they were during the reign of terror and devastation.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XII.

*Progress of the Conspiracy under Voltaire.—First  
Class of Protectors.—Crowned Adepts.*

That the  
historian  
must be  
true.

**V**OLTAIRE's grand object, as we have seen, was to hurry away that whole class of men, styled by the conspirators the better sort, and instill into their minds his hatred for Christ and his religion: to have left his gospel to none but the rabble, and to them only, in case they could not efface it from their minds. Under this denomination of better sort, they comprehended all who were illustrious, either by power, rank or riches; and, after them, all people of education or instruction and honest citizens, ranking above what Voltaire calls rabble, footmen, cooks, &c. It is an observation worthy the historian, that the Antichristian Conspiracy first makes its progress in the most illustrious part of this class; among princes, kings, emperors, ministers and courts; in fine, among those who may be styled the Great.

If a writer dares not utter truths like these, let him throw aside his pen; he is unworthy of treating such important subjects of history. He who has not the courage to tell kings, that they  
were

were the first to league in the conspiracy against Christ and his religion, and that it is the same God who has permitted the conspirators, first to threaten, shake and silently undermine their thrones; then openly to scoff at their authority. The man, I say, who dares not hold such language is only abandoning the powers of the earth to their fatal blindness. They would continue to hearken to the impious, to protect impiety, and support its dominion, to let it circulate and spread from the palace to the city, from the towns to the country, from the master to the servant; infine, from the lords to the people. And would not such crimes call down vengeance from heaven? Will not heaven have too numerous crimes to avenge upon nations, not to curse them with luxury and discord, with ambition and conspiracies, or with all those scourges which portend the downfall of nations. Had the monarch alone, throughout his empire, raised his head against his God, who has told us that the crimes of the chief shall not be avenged upon his people. Once more let the historian be silent, if he dares not utter the truth. Should he seek the causes of a revolution in its agents, he would meet a Necker, a Brienne, a Philippe D'Orleans, Mirabeaux, and Robespierres; a confusion in the finances, factions among the great, insubordination in the armies, the people agitated and dis-quieted,

quieted, infine seduced. Will he, for that, know from whence these Neckers, Mirabeaux, or Robespierres, have arisen; whence this confusion in finance, this spirit of faction, this insubordination of the armies, or the seduction of the divers classes of the state? He will have seized but the last thread of the conspiracy. He will have seen empires in their agony, but he will have overlooked that slow fever which consumes them, whilst the violence of the fit is reserved to that last crisis which precedes dissolution. He will describe the calamities which every one has seen, but will he be the nearer the remedy. Let the historian reveal the secrets of the masters of the earth, to ward from them the conspiracy which shall fall back upon them; and we, what secrets do we reveal, secrets publicly printed for these ten years past, in their own correspondence with the chief of the conspiracy. It is too late to attack us on that point. Those letters were printed, to the great scandal of the public, to discover the favor of the impious man with the sovereigns of the earth; and when we show this protection avenged upon the sovereigns, it is not their shame we are seeking to divulge, it is their misfortunes and those of their people that we make known; the remedy then spontaneously manifesting itself, may avert or prevent, much greater evils. Such a motive is more than an equivalent, to all that could induce us to be silent.

In



In the correspondence of the conspirators there is more than one letter which deposes against the Emperor Joseph II. with all the possible evidence Joseph II. of such testimony, that he was initiated and had been admitted into all the mysteries of the Antichristian Conspiracy by Frederick.

In the first of these letters, Voltaire announced his victory in these terms: "You have afforded me great pleasure by reducing the infinite to its real value. But here is a thing far more interesting: *Grimm assures us, that the Emperor is one of ours. That is lucky, for the Duchess of Parma, his sister, is against us* \*."

In another letter, Voltaire exulting in so important a conquest, writes to Frederick, "A Bohemian of great wit and philosophy, called Grimm, has informed me that you had initiated the Emperor into our holy mysteries †." In a third in fine, Voltaire, after enumerating the princes and princesses whom he reckoned among the adepts, adds these words: "You have also flattered me with the Emperor's being in the way of perdition; *that would be a good harvest for philosophy* ‡." This alludes to a letter written by Frederick to Voltaire a few months before, in which he says, "I am setting off for Silesia,

\* 28th of Oct. 1769. † No. 162, Nov. 1769.

‡ Letter No. 181, 21st of Nov. 1770.

“ and shall meet the Emperor, who has invited  
 “ me to his camp in Moravia; not to fight as  
 “ formerly, but to live as good neighbours. He  
 “ is an amiable prince and full of merit. *He likes*  
 “ *your works and reads them as much as he can.*  
 “ He is the *very reverse of being superstitious.* In  
 “ fine, he is an Emperor such as Germany has not  
 “ seen long since. We neither of us like the  
 “ ignorant and barbarous, but that is not a reason  
 “ for exterminating them \*.”

Now that we are acquainted with Frederick's idea of a prince, *The very reverse of being superstitious and who reads Voltaire's works as much as he is able*, his encomiums are easily understood. They truly point out an Emperor such as Germany had not long since beheld, in fine, an Emperor as irreligious as Frederick himself. Both the date and last words, *But that is not a reason for exterminating them*, recalls to mind a time when Frederick, thinking the Sophisters too daring and hasty, sought himself to repress their imprudence, lest it might overthrow the whole political system of governments. It was not yet time to employ *superior force* or to pass the *last sentence*. The war then resolved on between Frederick and Joseph against Christ was not to be a war of Neros and Dioclesians; it was to silently undermine. Such

• 18th of August 1770.

was

was that which Joseph waged, as soon as the death of Maria Terefa left him at liberty to act. He carried it on with hypocrisy, for Joseph, as unbelieving as Frederick, wished to be looked upon as a very religious prince, and would protest that the slightest attack on Christianity was the most distant from his ideas. During his travels through Europe he continued to approach the sacraments, and perform his Easter devotions at Vienna and Naples, with that exterior piety, which could not seem to coincide with the hypocrisy of those of Voltaire at Ferney. He carried his dissimulation so far, that in passing through France, he refused to call at Ferney, though very near and expected there by Voltaire. It is even said, that in turning away he affectedly said, *That he could not bear to see a man, who, by calumniating religion had given the severest blow to humanity*; what credit is to be given to these words, I will not pretend to decide, but certain it is, that the philosophers did not the less look upon Joseph as one of theirs. This slight of Voltaire was soon pardoned; they spread every where, that his admiration had not diminished for the premier in impiety; that he would have willingly visited him, but that he had refrained through regard for his mother, *who at the solicitations of the priests, had made him promise that he would not see him during his journey* \*.

\* See note to the letter of the Count de Touraille, 6th of Aug. 1777, General Correspondence of Voltaire.

Notwithstanding his reserve and his dissimulation, the war which Joseph waged, soon became one of authority and oppression, of rapine and violence, and was well nigh ending in the extermination of his own subjects. He began by the suppression of a large number of monasteries; this we have seen was a leading feature in Frederick's plan; he seized on a great part of the ecclesiastical property; so would Voltaire have done, when he exclaims, *But I had rather plunder them*; Joseph II. tore from their cells and cloisters, even to those Carmelite nuns, whose extreme poverty could afford no bait to avarice and whose angelic fervor left no room for reform. He was the first who gave to his age the public show of holy virgins reduced to wander into distant countries, even as far as Portugal, to seek an asylum for their piety. Innovating at pleasure in the church, he only anticipated that famous constitution of the clergy, called *civil* by the Jacobin legislators, and which prepared the way to the butchery at the Carmes. The sovereign pontiff thought it incumbent on him to leave Rome and pass into Austria, and in the capacity of common father of the faithful, personally to represent to the emperor the laws and rights of the church. \* Joseph II. receives him with respect, and permits all that homage and public veneration should be shown to Pius VI., which both his virtues and dignity equally commanded.

manded. He did not for that cease to continue his war of oppression. He did not expel the bishops, but he gave them much trouble; for constituting himself in some sort the superior of a seminary, he would permit no lectures to be read but by those professors he had chosen, and whose doctrine like that of *Camus* tended only to forward the grand apostacy; at length these secret persecutions and depredations gave rise to murmurs. The wearied Brabanters revolted. Since that, we have seen them call in those Jacobins who promising them the free exercise of their religion, and more artful than Joseph, are now consummating his work. Had they been less tormented by Frederick's adept in matters of faith, the Brabanters would have been less impatient under the yoke of Austria: had they been penetrated with a greater zeal and affection for the Emperor Joseph, they would have better seconded, and have had more confidence in the virtues of Francis II. They would with greater force have opposed that invasion which we have seen extend to the very banks of the Danube. Should history lay the blame on Joseph, let it look back to that day, when by Frederick, he is initiated into the mysteries of Voltaire. It is the emperor adept, that shall be found guilty of this war of extermination, which has threatened even to his throne.

In the sequel of this work we shall see Joseph repenting of the war he had waged against Christ, when he beheld philosophism attacking both himself and his throne. He will then attempt but too late to repair his fault. He will fall a melancholy victim.

Many other sovereigns are mentioned in the correspondence of the conspirators, as having imprudently engaged in these plots. D'Alembert complaining to Voltaire of the obstacles he sometimes encountered, and which he terms *persecutions*, from the public authorities, at length consoles himself by adding, "But we have on our side, the Empress Catherine, the King of Prussia, the King of Denmark, the Queen of Sweden and her son, many princes of the empire and all England\*." Much about the same time, Voltaire writes to the king of Prussia, "I know not what Mustapha thinks (on the immortality of the soul); my opinion is, that he does not think at all. As for the *Empress of Russia, the Queen of Sweden, your sister, the King of Poland, and Prince Gustavus* son of the Queen of Sweden, I imagine that I know what they think†."

Voltaire effectually knew it. The letters of these sovereigns could not leave him in the dark; but had we not those letters to adduce in proof,

\* 28th of Nov. 1770.

† 21st of Nov. 1770.

we now see an Emperor, an Empress, a Queen and four Kings who had already enlisted under the banners of the conspirators.

In baring to the light this horrid conspiracy, <sup>False consequences to be avoided in speaking of the royal adepts.</sup> let not the historian abandon himself to false declamation nor draw inferences still more deceitful. Let him not pretend to say to the people, your kings have shaken off the yoke of Christ, it is but just, that you should throw off that of their dominion; such reasoning would be to blaspheme Christ, his doctrines and his examples. The arm of vengeance is reserved to God alone. For the happiness of subjects, to preserve them from revolutions and all the horrors of rebellion, he alone can smite the apostate on the throne. Let not the Christian apostatize, but let him be subject to his lawful prince. To join revolt to impiety is not averting the scourge of heaven; that would be only adding anarchy, the most terrible of political scourges; that would not be a bar against the Sophister of impiety, but the consummation of the conspiracy of the Sophisters of sedition, against the throne and all the laws of civil society. Such was the fate of the unfortunate Brabanters when in rebellion against the Emperor Joseph. They pretended to the right of rejecting their lawful sovereign, and they are become the prey of Jacobins; they called insurrection to the aid of religion,

gion, and that religion proscribes insurrection against all lawful authority. At the time that I am now writing, the fulminating reports made to the Convention, forbode those dreadful decrees which levelling the religious worship, the privileges and the churches of the Brabanters to the standard of the French revolution, shall punish them for their error. When therefore the historian shall report the names of those sovereigns, who unfortunately were initiated and conspired against their God, let his intention be to recall them to their religion, let him not be led away into false consequences, so contrary to the peace of nations. Then let him insist on the duties which religion imposes on the people; let him teach them what they owe to Cæsar and to every public authority.

Catherine  
II.  
Empress  
of Russia.

Among the royal protectors all are not to be classed with Voltaire, Frederick or Joseph. All had tasted of the impious cup of incredulity, but all did not equally wish to imbibe their people with its poison.

Immense was the distance between Frederick and this Empress, in whom the conspirators placed so much confidence. Seduced by the talents and homage of their premier chief, Catherine may have been indebted to him for her first taste for literature; she almost devoured those works, which she had mistaken for masterpieces, whether in  
history



history or philosophy, totally ignorant of their being disguised solely to forward the ends of impiety. On the fallacious encomiums of the Sophisters, she boldly pronounced, *That all the miracles in the world could never efface the pretended blot of having hindered the printing of the Encyclopedia* \*. But we never see her, like Frederick, to obtain the fulsome flattery of the Sophisters, pay to impiety that degrading court. Catherine would read their works, Frederick would circulate them, compose himself and wished to see them devoured by the people. Frederick would propose plans for the destruction of the Christian religion, Catherine rejected all those proposed to her by Voltaire. She was tolerant by nature, Frederick only from necessity. He would have been no longer so, had his policy permitted him, in following the dictates of his hatred, to call in *a superior force* to effect the overthrow of Christianity †.

Never-

\* Her correspondence with Voltaire, letter 1, 2, 3 and 8.

† Those who, as men of literature, shall criticize the correspondence of this Empress, will find an amazing difference between hers and that of the King of Prussia. The former is that of a woman of wit, who often plays upon Voltaire in the most agreeable manner. With her light style and full of taste, she never forgets her dignity; she at least will not be seen to degrade herself to that gross dialect of abuse and blasphemy; while Frederick in his, truly the pedantic Sophister,

Nevertheless, Catherine is also a royal adept, she has the secret of Voltaire, she applauds the most famous of our infidels \*. She is even willing to entrust the heir of her crown into the hands of D'Alembert; her name constantly appears among the protecting adepts in the writings of the Sophisters, nor can the historian hide it.

Christiern  
VII. King  
of Den-  
mark.

The claims of Christiern VII. King of Denmark, to the title of adept, are also founded on his correspondence with Voltaire. Among the numerous services rendered by D'Alembert, I should not have omitted the pains he had taken to prevail on different powers and great personages, to subscribe to the erection of a statue in honor of Voltaire. I could have shewn the Sophister of Ferney, modestly pressing D'Alembert to get these subscriptions, and that in particular from the King of Prussia, who hardly waited their sollicita-

phister, will be as void of shame in his impiety, as he is of dignity in his encomiums. When Voltaire wrote to Catherine, " We are three, Diderot, D'Alembert and myself, who " raise altars to you." She answers, " Pray leave me, if " you please on earth, there I shall be more at hand to " receive your letters and those of your friends." Nothing so perfectly French can be found in Frederick's, we only have to regret, that it was addressed to a set of infidels. Catherine wrote Voltaire's own language in perfect purity, while Frederick could have had little pretensions to the hero, had he not handled his sword better than his pen.

\* 26th Dec. 1773, and No. 134, anno 1774-

tations.

tations. This triumph of their chief was too desirable for the conspirators; Christiern VII. eagerly contributed. A first letter, with a few compliments, could not constitute an adept, but we have Voltaire's own word for it. He mentions him, and besides, among these compliments we find one so much in the style of Frederick, "You are  
 " now occupied in delivering a considerable num-  
 " ber of men from *the yoke of the clergy, the bard-*  
 " *est of all others*, for the duties of society are  
 " only imprinted in their heads, *and never felt in*  
 " *their hearts. This is well worth being revenged of*  
 " *the barbarians* \*." Unfortunate monarchs! Such was the language held to Mary Antoinette, in the days of her prosperity, by those corruptors. But in her misfortunes, when she witnessed the loyalty and the sensibility of those *barbarians*, at the Thuleries, she exclaimed, "Oh! how we have been de-  
 " ceived! We now plainly see how much the  
 " clergy distinguish themselves among the faithful  
 " subjects of the king †." May the king that is led away by philosophism never be reduced to the same experiment; may he learn at least from one

\* Let. to Voltaire, 1770.

† I heard this anecdote in the midst of the revolution, and such expressions were necessary to show, that she was recovered from those prejudices she had imbibed against the clergy, and which appeared to have redoubled, after the second journey which her brother made to Versailles.

revolution,

revolution, that there is a yoke more *hard* and terrible than that of the clergy, which Voltaire his master had taught him to calumniate.

It is our duty to add, that with regard to this prince, as well as to many others who were seduced by the Sophisters, the conspirators had taken advantage of their youth. At that period of life, the writings of Voltaire could easily make impression on men, who for being kings, were not better versed than other people, in what they had not learned, nor were they able to discriminate truth from error, in objects where the want of knowledge is more to be dreaded, than inclination or the passions.

At the time of his journey into France, Christiern was but seventeen years of age, and already, to use D'Alembert's expression, he had *the courage to say at Fontainebleau*, that Voltaire *had taught him to think* \*. Men of a different way of thinking, about the court of Lewis XV. wished to hinder his young majesty from learning still more to think like Voltaire, and from seeing in Paris, the adepts or most celebrated of his disciples. These however, obtained admission, and to judge how well they understood improving their opportunity, we need only hear D'Alembert writing to Voltaire, "I had seen that prince at his own apart-

\* Letter of 12th Nov. 1768.

"ments,

“ ments, together with several of your friends.  
 “ He spoke much about you, *of the services your*  
 “ *works had rendered, of the prejudices you had root-*  
 “ *ed out, of the enemies your liberty in thinking*  
 “ *had made you.* You easily guess what my  
 “ answers were \*.” D’Alembert has a second interview, and again writes, “ The King of Denmark scarce spoke to me but of you.—I can  
 “ assure you, he had rather have seen you at Paris,  
 “ than all the entertainments with which they  
 “ have surfeited him.” This conversation had been but of short duration; but D’Alembert made amends in a discourse which he pronounced at the academy on philosophy, in presence of the young monarch. Numerous were the adepts present, and they applauded; the youthful monarch joins in the applause †. Infinite, such is the opinion he carries away of that pretended philosophy, thanks to D’Alembert’s new lectures, that no sooner is he informed of a statue to be erected to the premier chief of the conspirators, than he sends a very *handsome subscription*, for which Voltaire acknowledges himself to be indebted to the lessons of the academical adept ‡. How much these lessons have since been forgotten by Christiern VII., I cannot pretend to say. Sufficient

\* 6th Dec. 1768. † Let. 17th Dec. 1768.

‡ Letter from Voltaire to D’Alembert, 5th Nov. 1770.

events

events have taken place since his Danish majesty had learned *to think* from Voltaire, which may have given him a very different opinion of the *services* that the *WORKS* of his master have rendered to empires.

Gustavus  
III. King  
of Swe-  
den.

Similar artifices were made use of with regard to Gustavus, King of Sweden. That prince also came to Paris, to receive the homage and lessons of the self-created philosophy. He was as yet but Prince Royal, when already extolling him as one whose protection was insured to the sect, D'Alembert writes to Voltaire, " You love REASON AND  
" LIBERTY, my dear brother, and one can hardly  
" love one without the other. Well then, here  
" is a *worthy republican philosopher* that I present  
" you, who will talk PHILOSOPHY and LIBERTY  
" with you. This is Mr. Jennings, chamberlain  
" to the King of Sweden.—He has besides com-  
" pliments to pay you from the *Queen of Sweden*  
" *and the Prince Royal, who in the North PROTECT*  
" *that philosophy* so ill received by the princes in  
" the South. Mr. Jennings will inform you of  
" the *progress* REASON is *making in Sweden* under  
" those happy auspices\*."

At the time that D'Alembert was writing this letter, Gustavus, who was soon to restore royalty to the rights it had lost long since in Sweden,

• 19th Jan. 1769.

was

was no doubt ignorant that those great men, which he so much protected, were *philosophers* superlatively *republican*. He was equally ignorant what would one day be for him, the last fruit of this conspiring philosophy, when on his accession to the throne he writes to their premier chief, "I daily pray the Being of beings, that he may prolong your days, so precious to humanity and so necessary to the progress of REASON and TRUE PHILOSOPHY \*."

The prayer of Gustavus was heard, the days of Voltaire were prolonged, but he who was to suddenly shorten the days of Gustavus was born; he, grasping the dagger, was soon to fall forth from the occult school of Voltaire. For the instruction of kings, let the historian compare the gradual steps of this unfortunate prince and those of the adept and his assassin.

Ulrica of Brandenburg had been initiated into the mysteries of the Sophisters by Voltaire himself. So far from rejecting his principles, she did not even feel herself outraged at the declaration of a passion, which he was daring enough to express †. When Queen of Sweden, she more than once pressed the Sophister to come and end his days

\* 10th Jan. 1772.

† It was for this princess that Voltaire composed the *Madrigal Souvent un peu de Vérité*.

near

near her person \*. She knew no means of giving a stronger proof of her staunchness in the principles she had received, than during Voltaire's first residence at Berlin, to make the infant king imbibe them with his milk. She initiated Gustavus, and wished to be the mother of the Sophister as well as of the king; and indeed we constantly see both the mother and the son ranking together among the adepts, of whom the Sophisters thought themselves the most secure. Such then was the gradation of the unfortunate Gustavus. Voltaire initiated Ulrica, and Ulrica initiates her son.

On the other side, Voltaire initiated Condorcet, and Condorcet, seated in the club of the Jacobins, initiated Ankestron. A pupil of Voltaire, Ulrica, teaches her son to ridicule the mysteries and scoff at the altars of Christ. Condorcet also, a disciple of Voltaire, teaches Ankestron to scoff at the throne and sport with the lives of kings.

When public report announced that Gustavus III. was to command in chief the confederate armies against the French revolution, Condorcet and Ankestron were members of the great club; and the great club resounded with the cry of, Deliver the earth from kings! Gustavus was doomed for the first victim, and Ankestron offers him-

\* Her letters to Voltaire, anno 1743 and 1751.

self



self for the first executioner. He leaves Paris, and Gustavus falls beneath his blows \*.

The Jacobins had just celebrated the apotheosis of Voltaire, they also celebrate that of Ankestron.

Voltaire had taught the Jacobins that *the first of kings was a successful soldier*; and they teach Ankestron that the first hero was the assassin of kings; and they placed his bust beside that of Brutus.

Kings had subscribed to the erection of a statue to Voltaire, the Jacobins erect one to Ankestron.

Lastly, Voltaire's correspondence shows Poniatowski, King of Poland, to have been of the number of the protecting adepts. That king had known our philosophers in Paris, who was one day to fall a victim to philosophism! He had done homage to their chief, and written to him, "Mr. de Voltaire, every contemporary of a man like you, that knows how to read, who has travelled, and has not been acquainted with you, must feel himself unhappy; you might be allowed to say, *Nations shall pray that kings may read me* †." At this day, when the king has seen men, who, like himself, had read and cried up the works of Voltaire, attempting in Poland the revolution they

\* Journal of Fontenai.  
VOL. I.

† 21st of Feb. 1767.  
P had

had wrought in France ; at this day, when victim of that revolution, he has seen his sceptre vanish from his hand, how different must be his prayer ? Does he not repent that nations have known Voltaire, or that kings had ever read his works ? But those days that D'Alembert had foretold, and which he longed to see, are at length come, and that without being foreseen by the royal adepts. When the misfortunes of religion shall fall back upon them, let them read the prayer which D'Alembert expresses in his style, often low and ignoble, to Voltaire, " Your illustrious and former protector (the King of Prussia) began the dance, the King of Sweden led it on, Catherine imitates them, and bids fair to outdo them both. How I should laugh to see the string run off in my time." And indeed the string has begun to run with a vengeance. Gustavus, King of Sweden, dies by the dagger: Lewis XVI. King of France, on the scaffold: Lewis the XVII. by poison. Poniatowski is dethroned ; the Stadtholder is driven from his country, and the adepts, disciples of D'Alembert and his school, laugh as he would have done himself, at those sovereigns, who protecting the impious in their conspiracy against the altar, had not been able to foresee that the disciples of those same conspirators would conspire against their thrones.

These

These reflections anticipate, against my will, what I have to unfold in this second conspiracy; but such is the union of the Sophister of impiety with the Sophister of rebellion, that it is hard to separate the progress of one from the ravages of the other. It is the intimacy of this union, which has forced us to lay before the eyes of the protecting monarchs, one of the most important lessons that history could produce.

I cannot finish this chapter without remarking, that among the kings of the North, in whose protection the Sophisters so often exult, the name of his Britannic Majesty is not so much as mentioned. This silence of the conspirators, is above all the encomiums they could bestow. Had they sought a king beloved by his subjects, and deservedly so; had they sought I say, a king good, just, compassionate, beneficent, jealous of maintaining the liberty of the laws and the happiness of his empire, then George III. might have been extolled as the Solomon of the North, he would have been their Marcus Aurelius, or Antoninus. They found him too wise to coalesce with vile conspirators, who knew no merit but impiety, and hence the true cause of their silence. It is noble for a prince to be null in their records, whilst, in this terrible revolution, he has been so conspicuous by his activity in stopping its progress, by his greatness and compassionate generosity in relieving its victims.

P 2

It

It is also a justice, which the historian owes to the kings of the South, to say, that the conspirators, so far from ranking them among their adepts, complained that they had not yet attained to the height of their sophisticated philosophy.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XIII.

*Of the Adept Princes and Princesses.*

IN the second class of protecting adepts, I shall comprehend those persons, who, without being on the throne, enjoy a power over the people, nearly equal to that of kings, and whose authority and example, adding to the means of the conspirators, gave them reason to hope that they had not sworn in vain, the destruction of the Christian religion.

In this class of protectors, Voltaire particularly mentions the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel. The care, with which D'Alembert had chosen the professor of history we have already mentioned, shows how much the Sophister abused his confidence. He was much imposed upon when he confided in the philosophy and the lights of Voltaire; he permitted him in some sort, to direct his studies, and it was difficult to fall into the hands of a more perfidious tutor. A letter, in date of the 25th Aug. 1766, will suffice to show in what sources the august pupil was directed to seek lessons of wisdom. "Your Serene Highness has shown, the corruptor writes, a desire of seeing some

Frederick  
Land-  
grave of  
Hesse-  
Cassel.

“ new productions worthy your attention. There is  
 “ one which has just made its appearance, entitled  
 “ *The necessary Collection*. You will find there, in  
 “ particular, a work of Lord Bolingbroke's, which  
 “ appears to me one of the most forcible things ever  
 “ written against superstition. I believe it is to  
 “ be found at Frankfort; but I have a copy of it  
 “ sewed, which I will send to your Highness, if  
 “ agreeable.”

For a prince, who really was desirous of instruction, what lessons he was to find in this collection! The name of Bolingbroke does not sufficiently denote, how far they intended to pervert his religion; but we know that Voltaire often published, under that name, works far more impious than those of the English philosopher; and that he was the author of several of those, which he particularly recommended in that collection.

Left to himself for the solution of doubts, nourished by such readings, and unfortunately prejudiced against those who might have solved them, he threw himself headlong into those studies, which he had mistaken for those of truth, and of the most transcendent philosophy. When he could receive these lessons from Voltaire himself, the illusion was so great, that his Highness would flatter himself, and really believe that he had found a means of soaring far above the vulgar. He would lament the absence which deprived him of the lessons of  
 his

his master, and thinking himself under real obligations, he would say to him, " I left Ferney  
 " with the greatest regret. — I am delighted to  
 " find you approve of my way of thinking: I try  
 " as much as possible to divest myself of all pre-  
 " judices, and if in that, I differ in opinion from  
 " the vulgar, it is to my conversation with you,  
 " and to your works, that I am solely indebted  
 " for it\*."

That he might adduce some proof of his proficiency in the school of philosophism, the illustrious adept was wont to impart to his master, the new discoveries he had made, and which he looked upon as unanswerable objections against the sacred writ. " I have been making, would he write  
 " to his hero, for this some time past, reflections  
 " on Moses, and on some of the historians of the  
 " New Testament, to me apparently just; might  
 " not Moses be a natural child of Pharoah's  
 " daughter, whom that princess caused to be  
 " brought up? It is not credible that the daughter  
 " of a king, should have taken such care of an  
 " Hebrew child, whose nation was so much ab-  
 " horred by the Egyptians†." Voltaire could easily have solved such a doubt, by making his pupil observe that he was gratuitously slandering the fair sex, whose benevolence and tenderness

\* 9th Sept. 1766.

† Let. 66.

would readily lead them to take compassion on a child, exposed to such a danger. Many would naturally do what Pharoah's daughter did, and would precisely show it greater care and attention, was the child exposed to national enmities. Had Voltaire wished to give his illustrious pupil the rules of sound criticism, he would have hinted, that to destroy a fact both simple and natural, his Highness supposed one truly incredible. A princess who wishes to give her child a brilliant education, and begins by exposing it to be drowned, for the pleasure of going to seek it on the banks of the Nile, at a given time. An Egyptian princess, who, loving her child, and knowing how much the Egyptians hated the Israelites, causes this child to be suckled by an Israelite, leaves it to believe, that it was born of that nation, which its mother detests, and afterwards to render this child odious to the Egyptians, persuades them of the same. A mystery, still more singular, is that the birth of an infant, who became the man, the most tremendous to the Egyptians, has always remained a secret. That the whole court of Pharoah, obstinately believed him to be an Israelite, and that at a time when, to have declared Moses an Egyptian, would have sufficed to destroy his power with the Israelites and to have saved Egypt. Such arguments might have been made use of by Voltaire, to make his Highness sensible of the impropriety in sound criticism,



ticism, of combating a fact both simple and natural, by suppositions the most distant from probability. But such suppositions were consonant with that hatred which Voltaire bore to Moses and the Sacred Writ; he was better pleased to see his disciples ignorantly launching into incredulity, than to show them the rules of sound criticism.

Voltaire again applauded his adept, when his Highness pretends that the *brazen serpent*, isolated on the mountain, *did not a little resemble the god Esculapius*, in the temple of Epidaurus, holding a stick in one hand and a serpent in the other, with a dog at his feet. That the cherubims, displaying their wings over the ark, *were not unlike the sphinx* with the woman's head, and the four claws, body, and tail of a lion. That *the twelve oxen standing under the brazen sea*, and bearing that enormous vessel, twelve cubits in breadth and five in height, filled with water for the ablutions of the Israelites, bore a strong resemblance to the god Apis, or to the ox elevated on the altar and beholding all Egypt at its feet\*.

His Highness concludes, that Moses appeared to have introduced among the Jews, many ceremonies which he had taken from the Egyptians†. The historian will at least remark, that it would have been easy for the conspirators to have unde-

\* Let. 66.

† Ibid.

ceived

ceived an adept who fought only to be instructed. While we lament his Highness having been the dupe of such masters, in justice we are obliged to show how frankly he fought the truth, when he continues to Voltaire, "As to what regards the  
 " New Testament, there are stories in it, which  
 " *I should wish to be better informed of.* I cannot  
 " understand the massacre of the innocents. How  
 " could King Herod have ordered all those infants  
 " to be slain, he not having had the power of life  
 " and death, as we see in the history of the Pas-  
 " sion, and that it was Pontius Pilate, governor  
 " for the Romans, who condemned Jesus Christ  
 " to death \*."

Had he recurred to the proper sources of history, had he consulted any other but that professor of history which D'Alembert had given him, or any other masters than those vain Sophisters, this prince, who wished for and deserved better information, would have seen this slight difficulty vanish from before his eyes. He would have learned, that Herod of *Ascalon*, surnamed the *Great*, and who might have been more properly called the ferocious, he who ordered the massacre of the Innocents, was king of all Judea and of Jerusalem, and is not the person mentioned in the Passion. He would, moreover, have learned that the latter was Herod *Antipas*, who had only been able

\* Let. 66,

to obtain of the Romans one third part of his father's dominions, and being simply Tetrarch of Galilea, he had not the same power over the other provinces. Hence there can be little room for surprise at his not exercising the power of life and death in Jerusalem, though we see Pilate inviting him to exercise that right, by sending Jesus Christ before him, as he had before judged and caused to be beheaded St. John the Baptist.

As to the ferocious Herod of *Ascalon*, his Highness would have learned, that this prototype of Nero, had caused the infants at Bethlehem to be slain, by the same power with which he had murdered Aristobulus and Hircanus, the one the brother, the other an octagenarian and grand-father to the queen; by the same power did he put to death Marianne his queen and her two children; Sohemus his confidant and numbers of his friends and nobles of his court, who had had the misfortune to displease him. On reading of these numerous murders, of such unheard-of tyranny, and particularly when he learned that this Herod of *Ascalon*, on the point of death and fearing lest the day of his decease should prove a day of public rejoicing, had caused all the chiefs of the Jews to be shut up in the Circus, commanding they should be massacred at the moment he himself expired; such lectures, I say, could have left little doubt in the mind of the illustrious adept,

adept, whether this Herod exercised the right of life and death. He then would never have suspected the Evangelists of forging a fact like that of the massacre of the innocents, a fact so recent, that many Jews then living had been witnesses to it. He would have reflected that impostors would not expose themselves to be so easily discovered and that in so public a manner; and all his objections against this massacre of the innocents, would not have availed against his faith in the Gospel.

But he was nurtured in the same objections with his master, he studied the sacred writ through the same medium; and Voltaire, who had fallen into thousands of the grossest errors on those sacred writings, carefully avoided referring his disciples to those answers which he had received from the religious writers\*.

Though we blend these slight discussions with our memoirs, we will not add to the bitterness with which so many princes, who have been seduced by these impious chiefs of the Sophisters, now reproach themselves. We will not say to them, "With what strange blindness were you smitten. It was your duty to study the sacred writings, to learn how to become better, and to render your subjects more happy, and you have debased yourselves to entering the lists with the

\*. See the errors of Voltaire in the Letters of some Portuguese Jews.

"conspi-

“ conspirators, that like them you may dispute  
 “ against Christ and his prophets. If doubts arise  
 “ on religion, why appeal to those who have sworn  
 “ its ruin. The day will come when the God  
 “ of the Christians shall raise doubts on your  
 “ rights, and will refer your subjects to the Jaco-  
 “ bins for their solution. They are in your  
 “ dominions, seated in your palaces ready to  
 “ applaud, as Voltaire did, at your objections  
 “ against Christ and his prophets. Answer to  
 “ their sword, the objections they make to your  
 “ laws.” Let us forbear these reflections, let us  
 simply remark, as history must, how very unfor-  
 tunate these princes must have been, who seeking  
 instruction had applied to men, whose sole object  
 was to make them efficient to the destruction of  
 the altar, as the first step towards the overthrow  
 of their thrones.

In the number of the protecting adepts history <sup>Duke of</sup>  
 will find itself necessitated to insert the names of <sup>Brunswick.</sup>  
 many princes, whose states at this present moment  
 feel the sweets of this new philosophy. In the  
 account given by D'Alembert to Voltaire of those  
 foreign princes who would not travel through  
 France, without doing homage to the conspiring  
 Sophisters, we see him extol the *Duke of Brun-*  
*swick* as deserving *the kindest welcome*, and particu-  
 larly so, when put in competition with the *Prince*  
*of Deux Ponts*, who only protects *Frerons and such*  
*like*.

*like rabble*, that is to say religious authors \*. The Jacobin army at this day proves which of those two princes was most mistaken in his protection. It will be still better seen when in these memoirs, we shall treat of the last and deepest conspiracy of the Jacobins.

Louis Eugene,  
Duke, and  
Louis  
Prince of  
Wirtemberg.

To this prince we must add Louis Eugene Duke of Wirtemberg, and Louis Prince of Wirtemberg: both equally gloried in the lessons they received from Voltaire. The former writes to him, "When at Ferney I think myself a greater philosopher than Socrates himself †." The latter, not content with encomiums on the premier chief, petitions for the most licentious and the most impious work Voltaire had ever penned, I mean the poem of Joan D'Arc or the Maid of Orleans.

Charles  
Theodore,  
Electeur  
Palatine.

Charles Theodore, Elector Palatine, would once while solicit the impious Sophister for the same master-piece of obscenity, or for philosophic lectures; at another time he would press and conjure him to repair to Manheim, that he might there receive his lectures anew ‡.

The Princess  
Anhalt-Zerbst.

Even [to] those adepts who through modesty, should have shrunk back at the very name of such a production, even [to] the Princess Anhalt-Zerbst, sends thanks to the author, who had been impu-

\* 23d June, 1766.

† 1st Feb. 1766.

‡ Letters of the 1st May, 1754, and No. 38 anno 1762.

dent

dent enough to send her a present more worthy the Aretino \*.

The historian cannot but remark the eagerness of these mighty adepts for so profligate a work. This is an awful example of what charms depravity of morals gave to the productions of the Sophisters; the empire of the conspirators will cause less surprise when we reflect how prevalent their sophisms became over the mind, when they had once tainted and perverted the heart. This is a reflection we reluctantly make, but it is too apposite to the history of Philosophism, and to the cause and progress of the Antichristian Conspiracy, to be suppressed. We know the reverence due to great names, but we cannot, on that consideration, hide the truth. Let those look to it, whose misconduct is exposed to view; for to conceal it longer would be to betray at once their own interest, and that of their people, the safety of their thrones, and that of the altar.

Her Highness Wilhelmina, Margravine of Bareith, ranking among the protecting adepts, affords to the historian the opportunity of laying open a new cause of the progress of the Antichristian Sophisters, of the weight they acquired from the vanity of their school, and from their

\* Letters of the Princess Anhalt-Zerbst, 9th and 39th.

preten-

pretensions to a superiority of light above the vulgar.

It is far from being the lot of all men to argue with equal success on religious or philosophical topics. Without being wanting in the respect due to that precious half of mankind, we may observe in general, I think, that women are not born with a mind so congenial with philosophy, metaphysics, or divinity, as men. Nature has compensated this want of research and meditation, by the gift of embellishing virtue, by that sweetness and vivacity of sentiment, which often proves a surer guide than all our reasonings. They do the good peculiarly allotted to them, better than we do. Their homes, their children, are their real empires, that of their lessons lies in the charm of example, more efficacious than all our syllogisms. But the philosophic woman, philosophizing like a man, is either a prodigy or a monster, and the prodigies are not common. The daughter of Necker, the wife of Roland, as well as Mesdames du Deffant, D'Espignasse, Geoffrin, and such like Parisian adepts, in spite of all their pretensions to wit, can lay no claim to the exception. If the reader is indignant when he finds the name of the Margravine of Bareith on the same line, let his indignation turn against the man who inspired her with such pretensions. Let an opinion be formed of the  
masters,



masters, by the tone she assumed with them to insure their approbation. Here is a specimen of the style of this illustrious adept, aping the principles and the jests of Voltaire, in order to captivate his approbation, at the expence of St. Paul.

“ Sister Guillemetta to Brother Voltaire, greeting. I received your consoling epistle. I can swear by my favorite oath, that it has edified me infinitely more than that of St. Paul to Dame Elect. The latter threw me into a certain drowsiness that had the effect of opium, and hindered me from perceiving the beauties of it. Yours had a contrary effect; it drew me from my lethargy, and put all my vital spirits in motion again\*.”

We have no knowledge of any Epistle of St. Paul to Dame Elect; but Sister Guillemetta, like Voltaire, burlesquing what she had, as well as what she had not read, means no doubt to speak of St. John's Epistle to Electa. This contains no other compliment but that of an apostle applauding the piety of a mother, who rears her children in the way of life, exhorting her to charity, and guarding her against the discourse and schools of seducers. It is rather unfortunate that such lessons should have been opium for the illustrious adept. It is probable that Voltaire would have found a dose in the following letter, had it come from any other hand but that of Sister Guillemetta. We

• 25th Dec. 1755:

VOL. I.

Q

will

will however copy it, as making an epoch in the annals of philosophism. We shall there see the female adept attempting to give lessons to Voltaire himself, anticipating Helvetius by mere dint of genius, and without perceiving it copying <sup>ing</sup> Epicurus. Before she commences, Sister Guillemetta assures Voltaire of the friendship of the Margrave, and had carefully invoked the *Genius of Bayle*\*. One day she thought herself inspired with the whole of it, and immediately writes to *Brother Voltaire*, “ God, you say (in the Poem of the Law of Nature), has bestowed on all men justice and conscience to warn them, as he has given them all what is needful. As God has bestowed on man justice and conscience, these two virtues must be innate in man, and become an attribute of his existence. Hence it necessarily follows, that man must act in consequence, and that he cannot be just or unjust, or without remorse, being unable to combat an instinct annexed to his essence. Experience proves the contrary. If justice was an attribute of our being, chicane would be banished. Your counsellors in parliament would not lose their time as they do, in disturbing all France about a morsel of bread given or not. The Jesuits and the Jansenists, would equally confess their ignorance in point of doctrine—Virtue is barely accidental—Aver-

\* 19th July, 1752.

“ sion

“ sion to pain and love of pleasure, have induced  
 “ men to become just—Disorder can beget no-  
 “ thing but pain—Quiet is the parent of plea-  
 “ sure, I have made the human heart my par-  
 “ ticular study, and I draw my conclusions on  
 “ what has been, from what I see \*.”

There is extant a play intitled, *Divintly dwindled into a Distaff*. This letter of her Highness the Margravine of Bareith, dwindled into Sister Guillemetta, may perhaps furnish the same idea for philosophy. But handing over the female Socrates to the Molières of the day, the historian will draw from the errors of this female adept, a more serious lesson on the progress of the Antichristian Conspiracy. He will behold a new cause in the mortifying limits of the human intellect, and the vanity of its pretensions, which in certain adepts seem precisely to expand itself, in as much as nature had from the weakness of their understanding, seemed naturally to insinuate modesty and humility.

Sister Guillemetta fears for liberty, if it be true that God has given to man a conscience, the necessary sense of right and wrong. She was then ignorant that man, with the eyes that God has given him to see and know his road, is nevertheless free to go where he pleases. She has

\* 1st Nov. 1759.

Q 2

made

made a particular study of the human heart, and she has not yet learned, that man often sees what is best, but will do the worst ! She thinks herself in the school of Socrates, and with Epicurus, she only sees the *aversion of pain and the love of pleasure*, as the principle of justice and virtue. She tells us, in fine, probably without even perceiving it, that if chicane is not banished, it is because our attorneys have not a sufficient aversion to indigence ; that if our vestals are not all chaste, it is because they do not sufficiently love pleasure ; and after that, in presence of her Highness, Parliaments, Jesuits, Jansenists, and undoubtedly the whole Sorbonne, with the whole faculty of divinity, must confess their ignorance *in point of doctrine*.

Frederick  
William,  
Prince of  
Prussia.

With more genius but less confidence in his own lights, Frederick William, Prince Royal of Prussia, presents us with quite another species of adept. Indefatigable in the field of victory, he dares not answer for himself : he knows what he could wish to believe, but not what he ought to believe ; he fears to lose himself in reasoning. His soul repeats that he must be immortal, he fears her voice misleads him, and Voltaire is to decide for him ; when in the field of Mars, he has the confidence and activity of a hero ; but when he is to reflect on futurity, he has all the modesty and the humility of a disciple, almost the unconcern  
of

of a sceptic. The authority of his master is to save him the trouble of research, and his master again is Voltaire. " Since I have taken the liberty of conversing with you, he respectfully writes, suffer me to ask for my own instruction only, whether as you advance in years, you find no alteration to make in your ideas on the nature of the soul. I don't like to bewilder myself in metaphysical reasonings, but I could wish not to die entirely, and that such a genius as yours were not annihilated \*."

Like a man who can assume every tone, Voltaire answered, " The King of Prussia's family is much in the right, not to consent to the annihilation of his soul.—It is true that it is not well known what a soul is, as nobody has ever seen one. All that we know is, that the eternal Master of nature has endowed us with the faculty of feeling and knowing virtue. That this faculty survives us after our death, is not demonstrated; but then the contrary is not better proved. There are none but quacks who are certain, we know nothing of the first principles—Doubt is not an agreeable state, but certainty is a ridiculous one †."

I know not what effect this letter had on the serene and respectful disciple, but we see the pre-

\* 12th Nov. 1770.

† 18th Nov. 1770.

mier chief varying his means of power over his princely adepts, as much as he did over the citizens of Harlem. When the King, Frederick, wrote to him in so resolute a tone, *man once dead there is nothing left*; he takes care not to reply, that certainty is *a ridiculous state*, that *quacks only are certain*. No, Frederick, King of Prussia, is always the first of philosophic kings \*. And a week after, Frederick, Prince Royal, only wishes to be confirmed on the immortality of his soul, then it is, that notwithstanding all the troubles and inquietudes of scepticism, the doubts of the sceptic is the only rational state for the true philosopher. Such a state will suffice, as he then beholds his adepts no longer belonging to the religion of Christ, and that is sufficient for his plans. He will lead the king materialist, and resolute in his opinions, notwithstanding his own irresolution and uncertainty, by encomiums and admiration. He leaves Eugene of Wirtemberg in astonishment at the master he coincides with in opinion. Wilhelmina of Bareith, more daring than her master, is permitted to argue. He cuts short, and threatens with ridicule and quackery, the humble adept who seeks to reclaim and allay the ire of his master. To one he dictates his principles; to another he peremptorily declares that

\* See their letters, 30th Oct. and 21st Nov. 1770.

man

man is condemned to the total ignorance of the *first principles*. He is not the less the idol of the astonished princes. He does not the less transform them into the protectors of his school and of the conspirators; and such is the success with which he flatters himself, that writing to his dear Count D'Argental, he says, "At present there is not a "German prince who is not a philosopher\*."—That is to say, the philosophist of impiety! There are certainly exceptions to be made from such an assertion, but it will prove at least how much these abettors of impiety flattered themselves with the progress they were making among sovereigns and princes,—and to whom impiety was one day to prove so fatal!

\* 26th Sept. 1766.

---

## CHAP. XIV.

*Third Class of protecting Adepts.—Ministers,  
Noblemen and Magistrates.*

Errors of  
Louis  
XV.

IT was in France that philosophism had taken all the forms of a true conspiracy; and it was in France also, that it had made its greatest ravages among the rich and powerful. It had not gained the throne of Bourbon as it had many of the northern thrones, but it would be vain for history to dissimulate, that Lewis XV. without being of the conspiracy, powerfully helped the Antichristian conspirators. He never had the misfortune of losing his faith, he even loved religion; but during the last thirty-five years of his life, he so little practised it, the dissoluteness of his morals and public triumph of his courtezans answered so little to the title of his Most Christian Majesty, that he might nearly as well have been a disciple of Mahomet.

Sovereigns are not sufficiently aware of the evils they draw on themselves by swerving from morality. Some have supported religion only as a curb on their subjects; but woe be to him who  
only



only views it in that light. In vain shall they preserve its tenets in their hearts, it is their example that must uphold it. Next to the example of the clergy, that of kings is the most necessary to restrain the people. When religion is used only as a policy, the vilest of the populace will soon perceive it; they will look upon it as a weapon used against them, and sooner or later they will break it, and your power vanishes. If without morals you pretend to religion, the people will also think themselves religious in their profligacy; and how often has it been repeated, that laws without morals are but a mere phantom. But the day will come when the people, thinking themselves more consequential, will throw aside both morals and tenets, and then where shall be your curb.

Such were the discourses often held by the Christian orators in presence of Lewis XV. He without morals was soon surrounded by ministers destitute of faith, who could have seldom deceived him, had his love for religion been stimulated by practice. After the death of the Cardinal de Fleury some are to be found, the Marechal de Belleisle and Mr. de Bertin for example, who are not to be confounded in that class of adepts; but then we successively find near his person Mr. Amelot in the foreign department, Mr. D'Argenson in the same; the Duke de Choiseul, de Praslin and

and Mr. de Maleherbes, also the Marquise de Pompadour as long as she lived, and all these were initiated and intimately connected with Voltaire and his conspiracy. We have seen him make application to Mr. Amelot on the destruction of the clergy. This minister had sufficient confidence in Voltaire to intrust him with a secret and important mission to the King of Prussia, and Voltaire in return, does not conceal from him the use he had made of his mission against the church.

Mr. Amelot. He confided no less in that *Duke de Prælin*, to whom he had sent his memorial on the tythes, in hopes of depriving the clergy of the greatest part of their sustenance\*. This confidence from the premier chief sufficiently denotes the sentiments of those men to whom he sent his plans for execution.

Duke de Prælin.

Marquis D'Argenson. A minister whose assiduity in corresponding with Voltaire, indicates more clearly their perfect coincidence with each other, was the Marquis D'Argenson, whom we have already noticed, tracing the plan for the destruction of the religious orders. It was he who first protected Voltaire at court and with the Marquise de Pompadour; he was also one of the most impious of his disciples, and to him it is, that Voltaire writes constantly, as to one of the adepts with whom he was

\* Letter to Count D'Argental, anno 1764.

most

most intimate. If any thing, he appears more resolute in his antireligious opinions than his master, his philosophism coincided more with that of the King of Prussia's, for he was also convinced that he was not two-fold, and that he had nothing to fear or hope for, when once his body should rest in eternal sleep\*.

More zealous and more active than the Mar-  
quis D'Argenson for the reign of impiety, the Duke de Choiseul better knew and more power-  
fully seconded the secrets of Voltaire. We have already seen him extolling this great protector in his quarrels with the Sorbonne; we have already seen why this duke, adopting and pressing the execution of D'Argenson's plans against the religious orders, began by that of the Jesuits. It would be useless to insist on this minister, his impiety is too well authenticated, and lest he might be mistaken for a Christian, he wished to refuse himself Christian burial, and to be buried, far from any religious monument, in the midst of his park where his cattle fed.

Thus did this series of Antichristian ministers, each partially anticipate the Jacobins in the overthrow of the altar. It was to the man, who was one day to see that very revolution in all its horrors, and at length fall a victim to it, that

\* See in the General Correspondence, the letters of Mr. D'Argenson.

these

these impious chiefs pay their greatest homage, it was to him they were chiefly indebted. And this protector of the conspiracy against his God, was Maleherbes; this name, I am aware, will recall to mind many moral virtues, it will recall his benevolence when alleviating the rigor of the prisons, when remedying the abuse of the *Lettres de Cachet*; but France shall, nevertheless, demand of him her temples in ruin; for it was he who above all other ministers abused his authority to establish the reign of impiety in France. D'Alembert, who knew him well, always vouches for his reluctantly executing the *superior orders* issued in favor of religion, and for his favoring philosophism whenever circumstances would permit; and unfortunately he knew but too well how to avail himself of circumstances. By his office he particularly presided over the laws relative to the press, but with a single word he effaced all distinctions in books, whether impious, religious or seditious, he declared them all to be *a mere object of commerce*.

Liberty of  
the press  
dangerous  
in  
France.

Let politicians of other nations argue on that object in consequence of what experience has taught them in their own countries; but it is an incontrovertible fact, that France owes the misfortunes of the revolution to the great abuse of the press, and to that real inundation of bad books at first only impious, but latterly both impious and

and seditious. There are also many reasons peculiar to France which rendered the abuse of the press more fatal than elsewhere.

Without pretending to raise the merit of the French writers, it may be observed, and I have often heard foreigners repeat it, that there is a certain clearness, process and method peculiar to them, which by putting our French books more within the reach of the commonality of readers, makes them in some sort more popular and thence more dangerous when bad.

Our frivolousness may be a failing, but that failing made a book more sought for in France, than would the profoundest meditations of an Englishman. Neither truth nor error could please a Frenchman when latent, he likes to see clearly; epigram, sarcasm, in fine all what may be called wit, is what he delights in. Even blasphemy, elegantly spoken, will not displease a nation, unhappily gifted with the talent of laughing on the most serious subjects, and who will pardon every failing in him who can divert them. It was to this unfortunate taste that the impious writings of Voltaire owed their chief success.

Whatever may be the reason, the English also have their books against the Christian religion; they have their Collins, their Hobbes, their Woolstons, and many others, where in substance is to be found, all that our French Sophisters have  
only

only repeated after their way, that is to say, with that art which adapts every thing to the most vulgar minds. In England Hobbes and Collins are almost forgotten or unknown. Bolingbroke, and other authors of the same class, are little read, though of greater merit as literary men, by a people who knows how to occupy itself with other things. In France, from the idle marquis or countess unto the attorney's clerk, or even to the petty citizen, who had far other occupations, these impious productions, and particularly Voltaire's, were not only read, but each would have his opinion and criticise every new publication of the sort. The French, in general, were great readers, and every citizen would have his library. Thus in Paris a bookseller was sure of selling as many copies of the most pitiful performance, as are generally sold in London of a work of no small merit.

In France an author was as passionately cried up as a fashion; the Englishman, who deigns to read his work, passes judgment on it and remains unconcerned. Can this arise from good sense or indifference, or may it not be a mixture of both. Notwithstanding all the benefactions received from the English, I will not pronounce; neither flattery nor criticism is within my sphere; but an undoubted fact, and which ought to have taught Malefherbes, is that in France, still less than elsewhere, a book  
either

either impious or seditious never could be looked upon as a mere article of commerce. The greater readers, arguers, and the more volatile the French people were, the more the minister superintending the press, should have enforced the laws enacted to repress the licentiousness of it, which, on the contrary, he favored with all his power. His condemnation is recorded in the encomiums of the conspirators, it was he, they said, who *broke the shackles of literature* \*.

In vain would it be objected that the minister left the same liberty to the religious writers. In the first place, that was not always true, it was much against his will that he suffered works, refuting the Sophists, to appear †; and what a minister allows with reluctance, he finds abundant means of preventing. Could a minister be innocent, when letting a poison infuse itself throughout the public, under pretext that he did not forbid the sale of the antidote? Moreover, however well written a religious work may be, it has not the passions to second it; much more talent is required to make such a performance palatable. Any fool may attract the people to the theatre, but the eloquence of a Chrysostom is necessary to tear them from it. With equal talent, he who pleads for licence and impiety, will carry more

\* Voltaire to D'Alembert, No. 128.

† Ibid. let. 22 and 24.

weight than the most eloquent orator, who vindicates the rights of virtue and morality. The religious apologist requires a serious and an attentive reading, with a stedfast desire of finding the truth, and such a study fatigues, whereas, depravity requires none; in a word, it is far more easy to irritate, and throw the people into revolt, than to appease them, when once put in motion.

Malef-  
herbes  
during the  
revolu-  
tion.

At length Maleherbes, seeing the revolution consummated in the death of Lewis XVI. gave signs of a tardy repentance. His zeal, in that moment did not hinder men, who had deeply felt his fault, from exclaiming, "Officious defender, cease  
" to plead for that king you yourself betrayed, it  
" is too late. Cease to accuse that legion of re-  
" gicides, who demand his head; Robespierre is  
" not his first executioner; it was you that long  
" since prepared his scaffold, when you suffered  
" those impious works, that called the people to  
" the destruction of the altar and of the throne,  
" to be openly sold and displayed in the porticos  
" of his palace. That unfortunate prince con-  
" fided in you, he had imparted his authority to  
" you, to repress the impious and seditious writers,  
" and you permitted the people to inhale blas-  
" phemy and hatred of kings, from a Ray-  
" nal, an Helvetius or a Diderot, and you pre-  
" texted commerce. If then, to day, this people,  
" in the frantic crisis of those poisons you have  
" circulated



“ circulated in their veins, call aloud for the head  
 “ of Lewis XVI. It is too late to make a parade  
 “ of his defence, or to criminate the Jacobins.”

Mén of meditation and reflection, had long since foreseen the reproach that history would one day make to Malesherbes. They never passed the galleries of the Louvre, without exclaiming in the bitterness of their souls, *Unfortunate Lewis XVI! It is thus that you are sold at the gates of your own palace!*

Malesherbes, at length, leaving the ministry overpowered by the reclamations of the friends of religion, his successors undertook or pretended to undertake, to enforce the former laws. But presently, under the title of *Fables*, the Sophisters fought to spread their poison anew, and charmed with their success D'Alembert writes to Voltaire, “ The luck of it is, that these fables, far superior  
 “ to Esop's, are sold here (at Paris) pretty freely.  
 “ I begin to think the trade (of bookselling) will  
 “ have lost nothing by the retreat of Mr. de  
 “ Malesherbes \*.” It in truth lost so little, that the writers in defence of the altar and the throne, were the only ones thwarted in their publications †.

Mean-

\* Let. 121.

† We know of several excellent works which never could gain admission into France. Such was the case with Feller's  
 VOL. I. R PHILO-

Meanwhile the conspirators carefully calculated their successes with ministry. At the period when Lewis XVI. ascended the throne, they were already such, that Voltaire, writing to Frederick, expresses his hopes in the following terms: "I know not whether our young king will walk in your footsteps, but I know that he has taken *philosophers for his ministers*, all, except one, who is unfortunately a bigot. There is Mr. Turgot, who is worthy of your Majesty's conversation. The priests are in despair. THIS IS THE COMMENCEMENT OF A GREAT REVOLUTION \*."

Voltaire, in this, is correct to the full extent of the term. I remember, in those days, to have

PHILOSOPHICAL CATECHISM, because it contains an excellent refutation of the systems of the day. We are acquainted with several authors, and we might cite ourselves, to whom greater severity was shown, than the law could countenance, whilst it was openly transgressed in favor of the conspirators. Mr. Lourdet, of the Royal College, the censor of our Helvian letters, needed all his resolution and firmness to maintain his prerogative and ours, by publishing that work which the Sophisters would fain have suppressed, and that before the first volume was half printed. The same censor reclaimed in vain the power of the laws, to stop the publication of Raynald's works. That seditious writer had daringly presented his pretended PHILOSOPHIC HISTORY to the censure, and instead of the probate, he received the reproaches of just indignation. In spite of censure or laws, his work appeared the next day, and was exposed for public sale.

\* Let of 3d Aug. 1775.

seen

seen venerable ecclesiastics bewailing the death of Lewis XV. while all France and myself among others, were in expectation of better days. They would say, the king we lose, truly had many failings, but he that succeeds is very young, and has many dangers to encounter. They foresaw that same revolution which Voltaire foretels to Frederick, and they shed tears over it, in the bitterness of their hearts. But let not the historian blame the young prince for the unhappy choice in which Voltaire so much exults. Lewis XVI. to succeed the better in this choice, had done all that diffidence in his own abilities, or that the love of his subjects or of religion could suggest. This we see by the deference he paid to the last advice he received from his father, from that Dauphin whose virtues had long been the admiration of France, and whose death plunged it into universal mourning. This is again to be seen in the eagerness with which Lewis XVI. called to the ministry that man, who in Voltaire's style, was unfortunately a bigot. This was the Mareschal de Muy. When the historian shall discover the throne surrounded by so many perfidious agents of its authority, let him remember to avenge piety and Christian fervor, courage and fidelity, in fine all the virtues of a true citizen, when he shall treat of the memory of this Mareschal. Mr. de Muy had been the companion and bosom friend of the Dauphin,

The Mareschal de Muy to be excepted.

father of Lewis XVI. and such a friendship is more than an equivalent for the scurrilous abuse of Voltaire. The Mareschal de Saxe, was soliciting for one, whom he protected, the place of companion (menin) to the young prince. On being told that it was intended for Mr. de Muy, he replied, *I will not do Mr. Le Dauphin the injury of depriving him of the company of so virtuous a man as the Chevalier de Muy, and who may, hereafter, be of great service to France.* Let posterity appreciate such a commendation, and could the Sophister but hear and blush !

Mr. de Muy, was the man who bore the greatest resemblance to the Dauphin, who loved him. In him were to be found the same regularity and amenity of manners, the same beneficence, the same disinterested zeal for religion and the public welfare. It was through his means that the prince, unable to visit the provinces in person, was acquainted with the misfortunes and grievances of the people ; he sent him to examine their situations, and they were occupied together in seeking those remedies which the prince's premature death, alas ! hindered from being carried into execution. When, during the war, Mr. de Muy was called upon to give proofs of his fidelity in the victorious fields of Crevelt and Warbourg, the Dauphin would daily offer the following prayer for his safety : " My God, may thy sword defend, may thy shield  
" protect

“ protect the Count Felix de Muy, to the end,  
 “ that if ever thou makest me bear the heavy bur-  
 “ then of a crown, he may support me by his  
 “ virtue, his counsels and his example.”

When the God of vengeance struck France with its first scourge, when the hand of death had mortally struck the Dauphin, Mr. de Muy by his bedside, bathed in the tears of friendship, hears the prince, in a voice that could rend the heart asunder, pronounce these last words: “ Do not abandon  
 “ yourself to sorrow. Preserve yourself, to serve  
 “ my children. Your knowledge, your virtues  
 “ will be necessary to them. Be for them, what  
 “ you would have been for me. Bestow on my  
 “ memory, that mark of kindness; but above all,  
 “ let not their youth, during which God grant  
 “ them his protection, keep you at a distance  
 “ from them.”

Lewis XVI. ascending the throne, recalled these words to Mr. de Muy, conjuring him to accept of the ministry. Though he had refused it in the preceding reign, he could not withstand the entreaties of the son of his departed friend. In a court universally assaulted by impiety, he taught it that the Christian hero would, in no situation, be ashamed of his God.

When he commanded in Flanders, he had the honor of receiving the Duke of Gloucester, brother to the King of England, at a time when the

ministration philosophism made a terrible progress. Nothing proves it better than the choice of that Turgot, whose nomination is celebrated by Voltaire as the *beginning of a great revolution*.

Turgot. The philanthropy of this man has been much extolled, but it was that of a hypocrite, as the reader will be convinced of, by the following letter from D'Alembert to Voltaire: " You will soon receive another visit, which I announce to you. It is that of Mr. de Turgot, a master of Requests, full of philosophy, a man of great parts and learning, a great friend of mine, and who wishes to see you in luck. I say luck for *propter metum Judæorum* (for fear of the Jews); we must not brag of it too much, nor you neither\*."

If at first sight the signification of the fear of the Jews is not understood, D'Alembert will explain it in a second portrait of his friend: " This Turgot, he writes, is a man of wit, great instruction and very virtuous; in a word, he is a worthy *Cacouac*, but has good reasons for not showing it too much, for I have learned to my cost, that the *Cacouaquery* (philosophism) is not the road to fortune, and he deserves to make his †."

Voltaire had an interview with Turgot, and formed so true a judgment of him, that he an-

\* Letter 64, anno 1760.

† Letter 76.

swers,

fwers, “ If you have many licentiates of that stamp  
 “ in your sect, I fear for the *wretch*, *she* is lost to  
 “ good company \*.”

To every man who understands the encomiums of Voltaire or D'Alembert, this is as much as to say, Turgot is a secret adept, he is an ambitious hypocrite and will at once be a traitor to his God, his king and his country: but with us, we call him virtuous, he is a conspirator of the true stamp, necessary to compass the overthrow of Christianity. Had Voltaire or D'Alembert spoken of an ecclesiastic, or a religious writer who had only the virtues of a Turgot, what a monster we should have seen arise from his pen. Let the impartial historian examine, and lay aside these usurped reputations of virtue, let him say with truth, that Turgot, rich and above the common run of citizens, and still aiming at dignities and further fortune, cannot be called a real philosopher. Turgot being the adept of the conspiring Sophisters and a master of requests, is already perjured. He will be far more so when he arrives at the ministry. For by the standing laws of the state, he could only enjoy these dignities, by affirming both by himself and others, his fidelity to the king, to religion and to the state. He had already betrayed religion and the state, he will soon betray his king. He belonged to that sect of Œconomists who detested

• Letter 77.

the

the French monarchy, and only suffered a king, in order to treat him as did the first rebels of the revolution.

At length, carried to the ministry, by the cabals of the sect, he uses all his power to inspire the young king with his disgust for the monarchy, and with his principles on the authority of a throne, he had sworn to maintain as minister. He would willingly have transformed him into a Jacobin king. He first insinuates those errors, which are one day to throw the sceptre into the hands of the people, and overturn the altar and the throne; if those are the virtues of a minister, they are those of a treacherous one; if errors of the mind, they are of a mad-man. Nature had endowed him with the desire of relieving his fellow-creatures. He heard the declamations of the Sophisters against the remains of the feudal system, under which the people still labored, and what with the Sophisters, was a mere tool of their hatred for kings, he mistook for the cry of compassion. He was blind to what all the world saw, and that particularly on the Corvees. He would not hearken to the voice of history, which told him that the shackles of the feudal system had as yet been only broken, by the wisdom and mature deliberation of the monarch, foreseeing the inconveniences and the means of covering the losses of the suppression. But he would be  
hasty



hasty and he ruined every thing. The Sophists thought his dismissal too early, but alas! it was not early enough; for he had already tainted the throne with those revolutionary ideas on the sovereignty of the people; he had then forgotten that this was making all power depending on their caprice; he pretended to make the people happy by placing arms in their hands, with which they destroyed themselves. He thought to re-establish the laws in all their purity, and he only taught rebellion; he misleads the youthful monarch, too unexperienced, to unravel the sophisms of the sect; the very goodness of his heart leads him still more astray. In the pretended rights of the people, he only sees his own to be sacrificed, and it is from Turgot, we are to trace that fatal error of his insurmountable patience and fatal condescension for that people, whose sovereignty led to the scaffold himself, his queen and his sister.

Turgot is the first minister who shows that revolutionary spirit, at once antichristian and anti-monarchial. Choiseul and Malesherbes were more impious than Turgot, Choiseul perhaps was even more wicked, but never before had a minister been known, seeking to destroy the principles of that authority, in the mind of the king, which he imparted to them. It was reported that Turgot had repented on seeing the sovereign mob threatening his person, on seeing them bursting open the  
the

the magazines of corn, and throwing both corn and bread into the river and that under pretence of famine; it was then, as reported, that seeing his errors, he had laid open to Lewis XVI. all the plans of the Sophisters, and that these latter ever-after fought to destroy the idol they had set up. This anecdote, unfortunately for the honor of Turgot, is unfounded. Before his elevation to the ministry, he was an idol of the conspirators, and such he remained, until his death. Condorcet has also been his panegyrist and historian, and he would not have been tolerant on the repentance of an adept.

Scourges have fallen successively on France since the revolution, but prior to it they had succeeded each other in the persons of Lewis XVIth's ministers. Necker appeared after Turgot, and Necker re-appears after Briennes. And his virtues were extolled by the Sophisters nearly as much as he extols them himself. This is another of those reputations, which the historian must judge by facts, not for the mere pleasure of detecting the conspiring hypocrite, but because *these unmerited reputations were a means employed for the consummation of the conspiracy.*

**Necker.** Necker, as yet a banker's clerk, was employed by some speculators both as the confidant and agent, in a business which was suddenly and greatly to augment their fortunes. They had the secret of an approaching

approaching peace, which was considerably to enhance the value of the Canada Bills ; one of the conditions of the future peace being, the payment of those bills which had remained in England : they let Necker into the secret, on condition that for their common emolument, he would write to London to have a number of these bills bought up at the low price which the war had reduced them to. Necker engaged in the association, and through the credit of his master, the bills were monopolized. His associates, returning to know the state of the bargain, he told them that the speculation had appeared so hazardous and bad, that he had desisted from and countermanded the purchase. Peace comes, and Necker is in possession of these bills on his own account alone, and these make near three millions Tournois.—Such was the virtue of Necker when a clerk !

Now rich, he calls the Sophisters to his table ; his house becomes a weekly club, and the new Mécenas is well repaid for his good cheer by the encomiums and flattery of his guests. D'Alembert, and the chiefs of the conspirators, punctually attended these assemblies every Friday \*. Necker hearing of nothing but philosophy, would be a philosopher, as suddenly as he became a lord, and the intrigue and encomiums of the sect would

\* Correspondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, Let. 31, anno 1770.

transform

transform him into a Sully. At length Lewis XVI. hearing so much of the talents of this man in finance, called him to the ministry as Comptroller General. Among the many means of the conspirators, the most infallible was to introduce disorder in the finances. Necker succeeded completely in this plan, by those exorbitant loans which nothing could have hidden from the public, but that blind confidence, and those encomiums perpetually thrown out by the sect.—But let Necker have acted from the impulse of conspirators, like an ignorant minister who knew not whither he was driven, or knowingly hollowed out the abyss, it is not his pretended virtue that is to plead his defence. Is it not probable that the man, who, when recalled for the second time to the ministry, could dare to starve the people in the midst of plenty, in order to convulse them into a revolution, could also attempt to ruin the finances to produce the same convulsive state? Such a virtue as his may be nearly classed with the blackest guilt.

At the time when Necker was recalled to replace Briennes in the ministry, at the time when his great generosity to the people was cried up, and that all France was stunned with his great feats, at that very time was he, in concert with Philippe D'Orleans, starving the people into revolt against their king, the nobles and the clergy.

This

This virtuous man had bought up all the corn, had ordered it to be shut up in store-houses, or in barges sent it from one place to another, forbidding the intendants to allow of the sale of any corn, until they had received his orders. The magazines remained shut. The boats <sup>sailed</sup> ~~came~~ from port to port. The people clamorously called for bread, but in vain! The parliament of Rouen, concerned for the state to which the province of Normandy was reduced, desired its president to write to the minister (Necker) to demand the sale of a great quantity of corn which they knew to be then in the province. His letter was not answered. The first president received a second summons from his body, to expatiate in the most pressing manner on the wants of the people; at length Necker answers, that he has sent his orders to the Intendant. His orders are executed, but the Intendant is obliged, for his own justification, to lay them before the parliament, and so far were they from what was expected, that they were barely an instruction to put off the sale, and to invent divers pretexts and excuses to elude the demands of the magistrates, and to rid him of their applications. Meanwhile the vessels laden with corn, proceeded from the ports to the ocean, from the ocean to the rivers, or simply to the interior of the provinces. At the period when Necker was driven from the ministry for the second time, the people were destitute of bread.

The

The parliament had then obtained proof that the same boats, laden with the same corn, had been from Rouen to Paris, and from Paris back again ; then embarked at Rouen for the Havre, and thence returned again half rotten. The *Attorney General* profited of this second dismissal to send circular orders to stop these proceedings, and to give the people the liberty of buying this corn. At the expulsion of this minister, the populace of Paris, stupidly sovereign, run to arms, and demand their Necker, carrying his bust through the streets with that of Philippe D'Orleans, and never were two assassins better coupled in their triumph. The populace would have its executioner, which it stupidly stiled its father ; and Necker, on his return, starves it anew. Scarce had he heard of the orders which the *Attorney General* of the Parliament of Normandy had given, when the revolutionary agents are sent from Paris, the people are stirred up against the magistrate, his mansion is forced and pillaged, and a price is put upon his head !— Such were the virtues of the adept Necker, when minister and protector of the conspirators.

For the authenticity of these facts, the historian will appeal to the chief magistrates of the parliament of Rouen. If to shew the chief agent of such horrid deeds, I have been obliged to anticipate on the second part of this work ; it is because Necker had conspired against the throne, equally

as against the altar. It was through him the Sophisters were to draw the Calvinists into their party, but pretending to the faith of Geneva he was really a Deist. Had not the Calvinists been blind to conviction, they could have seen it in his writings or in his universal connections with the impious. For this empty and vain man aimed at every thing. From a Clerk he became Comptroller-General; next a protecting Sophister, and hence concluded he was a divine. He published his ideas on RELIGIOUS OPINIONS, and this work was nothing less than Deism, and that is not judging severely a work, which does not look upon the existence of God as proved; for what can the religion of that man be, who doubts of the existence of a God? This work obtained for its author an academic crown, as being the best production of the day; that is to say, that could insinuate the most impiety the least perceived.

After what has been said of the minister Briennes, Briennes, the intimate friend of D'Alembert; after the wickedness of this man has been so public, I should not mention him had I not to discover a plot, the like of which history would blush to show, and none but the annals of the modern Sophisters could produce. Under the name of Œconomists, the conspirators held secret meetings (which later we shall lay open to the public), and impatiently waited the death of Mr.

VOL. I.

S

de

de Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris, to give him a successor, who entering into their views, and, under the pretext of humanity, kindness and toleration, was as patiently to endure with Philosophism, Jansenism and all other sects, as Mr. de Beaumont had strenuously opposed them. He was to be particularly indulgent as to the discipline of the parish clergy, even to let it decay in a few years. On tenets he was to be equally patient. He was to repress the zeal of those who appeared too active; to interdict them, even to displace them as men too ardent or even turbulent. He was carefully to receive all accusations of this sort, and replace the over-zealous by men whom the Sophisters had prepared and would recommend, particularly for dignitaries. By this plan the parish churches, as yet administered by a most edifying clergy, were soon to be overrun by the most scandalous. Sermons and catechistical lectures becoming daily less frequent; in fine, all instructions running in the philosophic strain, bad books daily multiplying; the people seeing in their parishes none but a clergy scandalous in their morals, and little zealous in their doctrine, were naturally to abandon the churches and their religion. The apostasy of the capital was to carry with it that of the most essential diocese; and hence the evil was to spread far around. Thus without violence, *without being perceived,*



*ected*, by the sole connivance of its chief pastor, religion was to be crushed in the capital; not but what Briennes might have given some exterior signs of zeal, had the circumstances required \*.

Nothing but the ambition of a Briennes, and the wickedness of his heart, could have made him accept the archbishopric on such conditions. The agreement made, the Sophisters put all their agents in motion. The court is beset; an artful man, of the name of Vermon, who had been made reader to the queen by Choiseul, on the recommendation of Briennes, seized on this opportunity to make some return to his protector. The queen recommended the protector of Vermon, and she thought she was doing well; the king thought he did still better in nominating the man, whose moderation, whose prudence and whose genius, were so perpetual a topic, to the Archbishopric of Paris: and during one day Briennes was really named. But no sooner was it known either at court or in Paris, than every Christian shuddered at the news. The king's aunts and the Princess de Marfan in particular, immediately foresaw the scandal with which France was threatened, and the king prevailed upon by their prayers, annulled what he had already done. The archbishopric was given to a man whose modesty,

\* See hereafter the declaration of Mr. le Roi,

zeal and impartiality, would form the strongest contrast, with the vices of Briennes. Unfortunately for France neither the king nor particularly the queen were sufficiently convinced, to lose all confidence in the pretended virtues of this man, nor did the conspirators lay all hopes aside of hereafter raising him to a more exalted station.

Like to the thunder-bolt hidden in the clouds, blackened by the tempest and waiting the convulsion of the heavens to break forth, so did Briennes, from the dark cloud which threatened France, convulsed during the sitting of the Notables, called by Calonne, burst forth prime minister. To show his subserviency to the Sophisters, he began by that famous edict which Voltaire had solicited twenty years before in behalf of the Huguenots, though he had looked upon them as *mad* and *raving mad* \*; by that edict so long wished for by D'Alembert, as a means of *duping* the Protestants and of *crushing* Christianity, without its *even being perceived* †. Offspring of the tempest, he is at length overpowered by those billows which carried Necker to the helm, and which Necker holds solely to immerse his king, the nobility and the clergy into that sea of impious sophistry and frantic rage, which the conspirators

\* Letter to Marmontel, 21st August 1767.

† Letter 4th of May 1762.

had

had created.—Briennes died covered with infamy, but without remorse or giving signs of repentance.

By the same intrigue that had carried Briennes Lamoignon. to the prime ministry, Lamoignon, whose ancestors had been an ornament to the magistracy, obtained the seals. He was notoriously like many other courtiers, an unbeliever, but he was also one of the conspirators. His name is to be found in their most secret committees. On his disgrace which soon followed that of Briennes, he *philosophically* shot himself.—Two such men at the head of the ministry! what means had they not, of countenancing and forwarding the Antichristian Conspiracy!

Posterity will find it difficult to conceive that a monarch so religious as Lewis XVI. should have been surrounded by such a set of impious ministers. Their surprise will be much lessened, when they consider that the conspirators aimed mostly at the higher orders of society, and that they wished to destroy religion in those chiefly who approached the person of the monarch\*. To the passions of this privileged class, let the facility of satisfying them be added, and we shall easily conceive with what facility Voltaire could attack a religion which so much militated against those passions. Without doubt, eminent virtues and

Why so many impious ministers.

\* Voltaire to Diderot, 25th December 1762, to D'Alembert and Damilaville.

speaks of Choiseul. "I have the greatest obligations to him. It is to him alone that I owe all the privileges I have on my estate. Every favor that I have asked *for my friends* he has granted\*."

Duc  
D'Uzez.

Some of these protectors also aimed at being authors, and without Voltaire's talents fought to inspire the people with the same principles. Of this number was the Duke D'Uzez who, to verify the expression of Voltaire that he was stronger in mind than in body, had undertaken a work in favor of liberty and equality applied to our belief in matters of faith, without consulting either church or pastor. Voltaire only wished to see it finished to declare the work as useful to society as it was to the duke himself†. This work never appeared, so we know not how to class the genius of the noble divine.

Other  
great personages.

In Voltaire's letters we find many other great personages who swell the list of adepts and protectors, many names already famous in history; such was the descendant of a *Crillon* or a *Prince of Salme*, both worthy of better days according to Voltaire; but let not the reader mistake them, for the age of the Bayards and of those bold knights of former times; no, it is of an age worthy of *their modesty and their philosophic science*. We

\* Letter 110, anno 1762.

† Voltaire to the Duc D'Uzez, 19th Nov. 1760.

see

see Voltaire placing all his hopes in the prince of Ligne for the propagation of his sophisticated science throughout Brabant; and the Duke of Braganza, is as much extolled for the similarity of his sentiments.

Among the Marquisses, Counts and Chevaliers, we find the Marquis D'Argence de Derac, a brigadeer-general, zealous in the destruction of Christianity in the province of Angoumois, and modernizing his fellow-countrymen, with his philosophic ideas.—The Marquis de Rochefort, Colonel of a regiment, who through his philosophism had gained the friendship of Voltaire and D'Alembert.—The Chevalier Chattellux bold but more adroit in the war against Christianity. In fine, were we to credit Voltaire, nearly all those whom he was acquainted with in this class, were what he styles honest men in a letter to Helvetius in 1763. “ Believe me, he writes, that Europe is full of “ men of reason, who are opening their eyes to “ the light. Truly the number is prodigious. “ I have not seen for these ten years past *a single* “ *honest man* of whatever country or religion he “ may have been, *but what absolutely thought as* “ *you do.*” It is probable, and it is to be hoped that Voltaire greatly exaggerated his success. It would be impossible to conceive, that of the numbers of the nobility who went to contemplate the Grand Lama of the Sophisters at Ferney, the greatest

greatest part were not attracted by curiosity, rather than impiety. The surest rule by which we may distinguish the true adepts, is by the confidence he placed in them, or whether he sent them the productions of his own pen or those of other conspirators. At that rate even the list would greatly extend. Many duchesses and marchionesses would be found, as philosophic as Sister Guillemetta. But let them be forgotten those adepts more dupes than wicked, more unfortunate are they still, if they are above being pitied.

Count  
D'Ar-  
gental.

Of these protectors, the Count D'Argental honorary counsellor of the parliament, is to be particularly distinguished. Nearly of the same age as Voltaire, he always had been his bosom friend. All that Mr. de la Harpe says of the amiability of this Count, may be true, but however amiable, it will also be true to say, that both the Count and Countess D'Argental were the dupes of their admiration and friendship for Voltaire. He corresponds as regularly with these two adepts as he did with D'Alembert, and as confidently exhorts them to crush the wretch. He styles them his two angels. He employed the Count as general agent for all higher protections, that he might stand in need of, and few agents were more devoted or more faithful, that is to say more impious\*.

\* See General Correspondence.

A name

A name of greater importance, and that is not to be overlooked among the protecting adepts, is that of the Duc de la Rochefoucault. To him who knows how much the Duke must have been mistaken in his own wit, it will be matter of little surprise to see him so seldom mentioned in Voltaire's correspondence; but facts supply the place of written proofs. The Duke had been weak enough to allow himself to be persuaded, that impiety and Philosophism could alone give him a reputation. He protected the Sophisters, and even pensioned Condorcet. It would have been happy for him had he not waited for the murderers sent by Condorcet himself, to learn what were the real principles of this Philosophism.

In foreign courts, many great personages thought to soar above the vulgar, by this same Sophistry. Voltaire could not sufficiently admire the zeal of Prince Gallitzin, in dedicating the most impious of Helvetius's works to the Empress of Russia \*. He was still more delighted with Count Schouwallow, the powerful protector of the Sophisters at that Court, and with all those, by whose intrigues D'Alembert had been nominated for the education of the heir to the Imperial diadem.

In Sweden, whence the Chamberlain Jennings, under the auspices of the King and Queen, had gone to announce to the patriarch of Ferney, the

\* Let. 117, to D'Alembert.

great

great progress of Philosophism in that country \*, an adept was to be found far more extolled by the conspirators. This was the Count de Creutz, ambassador in France, and afterwards in Spain. He had so well blended his embassy with the apostleship of impiety, that Voltaire, enraptured, was inconsolable at his departure from Paris. He writes to Madame Geoffrin, " Had there been an Emperor Julian on earth, the Count de Creutz should have been sent on embassy to him, and not to a country where Auto-da-fés are made. The senate of Sweden must have been mad, not to have left such a man in France; he would have been of use there, and it is impossible that he should do any good in Spain †."

But this Spain, so much despised by Voltaire, could produce a D'Aranda, whom he styles the *Favorite of Philosophy*, and who daily went to stimulate his zeal, in the company of D'Alembert, Marmontelle, and Mademoiselle D'Espinasse, whose club nearly equalled the French Academy.

Other dukes and grandees were to be found in Spain, equally admiring the French Sophistry. In particular the Marquis de Mora and the Duke of Villa Hermosa ‡. In this same country, so much despised by the Sophisters, we find D'Alembert distinguishing the Duke of Alba. It is of him

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 19th Jan. 1769.

† 21st May, 1764.

‡ Let. of Voltaire, 1st May 1768.

that



that he writes to Voltaire, " One of the first  
 " grandees of Spain, a man of great wit, and the  
 " same person who was ambassador in France, under  
 " the name of Duke of Huescar, has just sent me  
 " twenty guineas towards your statue ; condemned,  
 " he says, secretly to cultivate my reason, I joy-  
 " fully seize this opportunity of publicly testifying  
 " my gratitude to the great man, who first pointed  
 " out the road for me \*."

It was at the sight of so numerous a list of disciples, that Voltaire exclaimed, " Victory declares  
 " for us on all sides ; I do assure you that in a little  
 " time, nothing but the rabble will follow the stan-  
 " dard of our enemies †." He did not sufficiently  
 dive into futurity, or he would have seen that  
 rabble misled one day by the same principles,  
 and sacrificing its masters on the very altar they  
 had raised to impiety.

As to D'Alembert, he could not contain him-  
 self, when informed of the numerous admirers that  
 flocked to Ferney. " What the devil, would he  
 " write, forty guests at table, of whom two mas-  
 " ters of requests and a counsellor of the grand  
 " chamber, without counting the Duke of Villars  
 " and company ‡." Dining at Voltaire's, to be  
 sure, is not an absolute proof of the philosophism  
 of the guest, but it shews, generally, men who ad-

\* Let. 108, anno 1773.

† Let. to Damilaville.

‡ Let. 76, anno 1760.  
 misled

mired the chief of that impiety, which was one day to be their ruin.

It was not by chance that D'Alembert mentions the counsellor of the grand chamber. He was fully aware of what importance it was for the conspirators, to have protectors, or even admirers, in the higher orders of the magistracy. Voltaire was of the same opinion when he writes, " Luckily  
 " during these ten years past, that parliament (of  
 " Thoulouse) has been recruited by young men  
 " of great wit, who have read, and who think like  
 " you \*." This letter alone denotes how much the tribunals were relaxed, for many years preceding the revolution. They were vested with all the authority necessary for stopping the circulation of these impious and seditious works, and of taking cognizance of their authors, but they had so much neglected it, that in the latter times, a decree of the parliament was a means of enhancing the price, and extending the circulation of a work.

Voltaire, notwithstanding the numerous conquests made in these temples of justice, often complains of some of those respectable corps, as still containing magistrates who loved religion. But in return he extols the philosophic zeal of those of the South. " There (he writes to D'Alembert)  
 " you go from a *Mr. Duché* to a *Mr. de Castillon*,

\* Let. 11, anno 1769.

" Grenoble

“Grenoble can boast of a *Mr. Servan*. It is impossible that reason and toleration should not make the greatest progress under such masters\*.”

This hope was the better founded, as these three magistrates, here named by Voltaire, are precisely those, who by their functions of attorney or solicitor generals, were obliged to oppose the progress of that reason, synonymous with impiety in the mouth of Voltaire; and to uphold the power of the law against those daily productions and their authors.

Mr. de la Chalotaix is of all others, the solicitor general who seems to have been in the closest intimacy with Voltaire. It is in their correspondence, that we see how much the conspirators were indebted and how grateful they were to him, on account of his zeal against the Jesuits, and how much the destruction of that order, was blended with that of all other religious, in their plans for the total overthrow of all ecclesiastical authority †.

But in spite of all this Philosophism, which had crept into the body of the magistracy, we meet with men venerable, and whose virtues were the ornament of the highest tribunals; particularly the grand chamber of the parliament of Paris, ap-

\* Let. of the 5th Nov. 1770.

† See their correspondence, particularly Voltaire's letter to Mr. Chalotaix, 17th May 1762.

peared

peared so opposite to his impiety, that he despaired of ever philosophizing it. He even does it the honor of ranking it with that *populace* and *those assemblies of the clergy*, that he despaired of ever rendering *reasonable*, or rather impious\*.

There even was a time, when he expresses his indignation to Helvetius in the following terms. "I believe that the French are descended from the centaurs, who were half men and *half pack-horses*. These two halves have been separated, and there remained, *men like you and some others*, also horses, *who have bought the offices of counsellor* (in parliament), or who have made themselves doctors of Sorbonne †."

It is an agreeable duty I fulfil, when I show proof of this spite of the Sophisters against the first corps of the French magistracy. It is certain that at the time of the revolution, many magistrates were yet to be found, who better informed of the intrigues of the Sophisters, would willingly have given greater vigour to the laws for the support of religion. But impiety had intruded even into the grand chamber. Terrey, as yet only known as a wicked minister, is not sufficiently so as a Sophister.

Trait of  
the Abbé  
Terrey.

Whatever may be the blackness of many facts mentioned in these memoirs, few are of a deeper hue than the following one.

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 13th Dec. 1763. † July 22d, 1761.  
The

The bookseller Le Jay, was publicly selling one of those works, the impiety of which sometimes commanded the attention of the parliament. That sold by Le Jay was ordered to be publicly burnt and the author and sellers to be prosecuted. Terrey offered himself to make the necessary perquisitions, and was to report to parliament. He ordered Le Jay before him, and I will lay before the reader the very words I heard the bookseller make use of, when he gave an account of what had passed on the occasion. As to the title of the work, I am not quite certain whether he mentioned it or not, but I perfectly remember what follows :—" Ordered before Mr. Terrey, counsellor in parliament ; I waited on him. He received me with an air of gravity, sat down on a couch, and questioned me as follows :—Is it you that sell this work condemned by a decree of the parliament ? I answered, Yes, my Lord. How can you sell such dangerous works ? As many others are sold.—Have you sold many of them ? Yes my Lord.—Have you many left ? About six hundred copies.—Do you know the author of this bad work ? Yes, my Lord.—Who is it ? You, my Lord !—How dare you say so ; how do you know that ? I know it, my Lord, from the person of whom I bought your manuscript.—Since you know it all is over ; go, but be prudent."

Vol. I,

T

It

It may be easily conceived that this interrogatory was not reported to the parliament, and the reader will equally understand what progress the Antichristian Conspiracy made in a country, where its adepts were seated in the very sanctuary of the laws.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XV.

*The Class.—Of Men of Letters.*

THE passions and the facility of gratifying them, the yoke of religion once thrown off, had given the conspirators great power among the higher classes of society; and the empty hopes of a reputation brought over to their standards all those who pretended to literary fame. The great talents of Voltaire, and a success perhaps superior to his talents, proclaimed his sway absolute, over the class of men of letters. Humbly those men followed his triumphant car, who above all others will proudly flatter themselves with the perfection of their own ideas. It was only necessary for him to give the fashion. Like to those frivolous nations where the high-flown courtezans, by their sole example, can introduce the most wanton fashions in attire, just so does the premier chief. Scarce had he shown his bias towards impiety, when the men of letters would all be impious.

From that cloud of writers and adepts, a man Rousseau shone forth who might have disputed with him the palm of genius; and who, for celebrity, needed not to resort to impiety. This was Jean Jaques

T 2

Rousseau.

Rousseau. That famous citizen of Geneva, sublime when he pleases in his prose, rivalling Milton or Corneille in his poetry, could have rivalled Bossuet under the banners of Christianity. Unfortunately for his glory, he was known to D'Alembert, Diderot and Voltaire, and for a time he leagued with them, and fought like them, the means of crushing Christ and his religion. In this synagogue of impiety, as in that of the Jews, testimonies did not agree; divisions ensued, but though separated, their attacks were bent against Christianity. This is to be seen in a letter from Voltaire to D'Alembert, where he says, "What a pity it is that Jean Jaques, Diderot, Helvetius and you, with other men of your stamp, should not have been unanimous in your attacks on *the wretch*. My greatest grief is, to see the impostors united, and the friends of truth divided\*."

When Rousseau seceded from the Sophisters, he did not by that forsake either his own or their errors; he separately carried on the war. The admiration of the adepts was divided. In either school, impiety had only varied its weapons, nor were opinions more constant or less impious.

Voltaire was the most active, but vigor was given to Jean Jaques. With the strength of Hercules he also partook of his delirium. Voltaire

\* No. 156, anno 1756.

laughed



laughed at contradiction, and his pen flew with every wind. Jean Jaques would insist on the paradoxes fostered in his brain, and brandishing his club on high, he would equally strike at truth or falsehood. The former was the vane of opinion, the latter the Proteus of Sophistry. Both equally distant from the schools of wisdom, both wished to lay the foundations and first principles of philosophy.

The *pro* and *con* was equally adopted by them, and both found themselves condemned to the most humiliating inconstancy. Voltaire, uncertain as to the existence of a God, or of a future state, applies to Sophisters bewildered like himself, and remains perplexed. Jean Jaques, as yet a mere youth, says to himself, "I am going to throw  
" this stone against that tree opposite to me: If  
" I hit, a sign of salvation; if I miss, a sign of  
" damnation." Jean Jaques hits, and heaven is his lot. This proof sufficed for the philosopher long after his youthful days; and he was far advanced in years when he says, "Ever after that  
" I never doubted of my salvation \*."

Voltaire one day believed he could demonstrate the existence of the *Author of the Universe*; he then believed in an all-powerful God, who remunerated virtue †. The day after, the whole of

\* His Confessions, book 6th.

† Voltaire on Atheism.

this demonstration is dwindled into probabilities and doubts, which it would be the summit of ridicule to pretend to solve \*.

The same truth is one day evident to Jean Jaques, nor does he doubt of it after having demonstrated it himself. He beheld the Deity all around him, with him, and throughout nature on that day, when he exclaimed, "I am certain that God exists of himself †." But the day following, the demonstration was forgotten, and he writes to Voltaire, "Frankly I confess that (on the existence of God), neither the *pro* nor the *con* appears to me demonstrated." With Jean Jaques as with Voltaire, *Theism and Atheism* could only found their doctrine on *probabilities* ‡. And they both believed in one only principle or *sole Mover* §. But at another time they could not deny but what there were two principles or two causes §.

Voltaire, after having written that Atheism would people the earth with robbers, villains and

\* Voltaire on Atheism; and on the Soul by Suranus.

† The Emile and Let. to the Archbishop of Paris.

‡ Letter to Voltaire, vol. 12. Quarto edit. of Geneva.

§ Voltaire on the Principle of Action.—Jean Jaques in the Emile, vol. 3, page 115, and Letter to the Archbishop of Paris,

§ Voltaire, Quest. Encyclop. vol. 9.—Jean Jaques, Emile, vol. 3, page 61, and Let. to the Archbishop of Paris.

monsters \*, would acquit Atheism in Spinoza, and even allow of it in a Philosopher †, and professed it himself when he writes to D'Alembert, "I know " of none but Spinoza who has argued well ‡." That is to say, I know of no true philosopher but he to whom all matter and this world is the sole God; and after having tried every sect, he ends by pressing D'Alembert to unite all parties in the war against Christ. Jean Jaques had written that the Atheists deserved punishment; that they were *disturbers of the public peace*, and as such guilty of death §. Then thinking he had fulfilled Voltaire's wish, writes to the minister Vernier, "I declare that my sole object in the New Eloisa, " was to unite the two opposite parties (the " Deists and Atheists), by a reciprocal esteem for " each other, and to teach the philosophers that " one may believe in God without being a hypo- " crite, or deny him without being a rascal §." And this same man writes to Voltaire, that an Atheist cannot be guilty before God. That should the law find the Atheist guilty of death, it was the denunciator who should be burned as such \*\*.

\* On Atheism. † Axiom 3.

‡ Letter to D'Alembert, 16th June, 1773.

§ Emile, vol. 4, page 68. Social Contract, chap. 8.

§ Letter to Mr. Vernier.

\*\* Letters to Voltaire, vol. 12, and New Eloisa.

Voltaire would blaspheme the law of Christ, retract, receive the sacrament, and press the conspirators to crush the wretch! Jean Jaques would lay aside Christianity, or resume it again, and with Calvin will partake of the Last Supper \*; will write the most sublime encomiums on Christ that human eloquence could devise, and then finish by blaspheming that same Christ as a fanatic †. If the Antichristian Revolution was one day to carry Voltaire triumphantly to the Pantheon, Rousseau had the same rights to the inauguration of the Sophisters of Impiety. We shall see him gain far other claims on the Sophisters of rebellion. If the former secretly solicits kings to subscribe to his statue, the latter openly writes that at Sparta one would have been erected to him.

\* D'Alembert writes to Voltaire, in speaking of Rousseau, " I pity him, and if his happiness depends on his approaching the Holy Table, and in calling holy a religion which he has so much vilified, I own that my esteem is greatly diminished." (Let. 105, anno 1762). He might have said as much of Voltaire's communions, but he never dared. He even seeks to give him a plea for his hypocrisy, when he says, " Perhaps I am in the wrong, for certainly you are better acquainted than I am, with the reasons that determined you." He does not mention his esteem being diminished; on the contrary, Voltaire is always his *dear and illustrious master*! Letter 31st May, 1768.

† His Confession and Professions of the Savoyard Vicar.

With

With so similar a conduct, each of these chief had his distinctive characteristics. Voltaire hated the God of the Christians. Jean Jaques admired but blasphemed him, and pride wrought in the latter, all that jealousy and hatred produced in the former; and it will long be a doubt which has been most fatal to Christianity, the one by his atrocious sarcasms and impious satire, the other by his sophistry under the cloak of reason.

After their separation, Voltaire hated Jean Jaques, scoffed at him, and would have him chained as a madman\*. But he could not hide his joy, when the Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar, written by this madman, was the book out of which youth were taught to read†. Jean Jaques would at the same time detest the chiefs of the conspirators, expose them and be hated by them: he would preserve their principles, court their friendship and esteem anew, and that of the premier chief in particular‡.

If to define the Sophister of Ferney was a difficult task, is it not equally so, to paint the citizen of Geneva? Jean Jaques loved the sciences and is crowned by those who reviled them; he wrote against the theatre and composed operas; he sought friends

\* Letter to Damilaville, 8th May 1761, and War of Geneva.

† Letter to the Count D'Argental, 26th Sept. 1766.

‡ See his letters, and the Life of Seneca by Diderot.

and

and is famous for his breaches of friendship. He extols the charms of virtue, and he bends the knee before the prostitute de Varens. He declares himself the most virtuous of men and under the modest title of his Confessions, he retraces in his old age the dissolute scenes of his youth. To tender mothers he gives the most pathetic advice in nature; and smothering in himself the cries of that same nature, he banishes his children to that hospital where, from the shame of its birth, the unfortunate babe is condemned to the perpetual ignorance of its parents. The fear of seeing them, makes him inexorable to the entreaties of those who would have provided for their education\*. A prodigy of inconsistency even to his last moments; he wrote against suicide, and perhaps it is treating him too favorably, not to assert that he himself had prepared the poison, which caused his death†.

However inconsistent, error is inculcated by the Sophister of Geneva, with all the powers of genius, and many have lost their faith by his works, who would have resisted all other attacks. To be cradled in one's passions, gave empire to Voltaire; but to resist Jean Jaques the acutest sophisms were to be seen through: youth was led away by the former, whilst those who were ad-

\* See his Confessions.

† See his life by the Count Barruel de Beauvert.

vanced

vanced in age fell a victim to the latter, and a prodigious number of adepts owed their fall to these two writers.

Indignantly would the manes of Buffon see Buffon. his name classed, after that of Jean Jaques, among the conspiring adepts. But difficult would it be for the historian, when speaking of those who have adopted the fashion set by Voltaire, not to sigh at pronouncing the name of the French Pliny. He certainly was rather the victim than the associate of the conspirators. But who can erase Philo sophism from his writings? Nature had lent her genius and why would he not content himself with what she had placed before him. No, he would ascend higher, he would explain those mysteries reserved to revelation alone; and soaring above his sphere, he often shows himself the disciple of Maillet and Boulanger. To give the history of nature, he destroys that of religion. He was the hero of those men whom D'Alembert had sent to split mountains and seek from the depths of the earth, arguments to belie Moses and the first pages of holy writ. In the praises of the Sophisters he consoles himself for the censures of the Sorbonne; but the punishment attached to the fault itself, for he only belied his own reputation on his knowledge of the laws of nature. They appeared to be null when he treated of the earth formed by the waters, or by fire, and of his endless epochs.

And

And to falsify the scriptures, he makes nature as inconsistent as his own systems. His style elegant and noble has always been admired, but found insufficient to save his works from the smile of the real philosopher; and his glory, like his comet, vanished in his dreams of incredulity. Happy, if in retracting his errors, he had been able to destroy that spirit of research in the adepts who only studied nature through the medium of Voltaire\*.

Freret.

After these two men so justly distinguished by the grandeur of their style, the remaining adepts chiefly owe their celebrity to their impiety; nevertheless two might have done honor to science by their learning. The first, which is Freret, had from his immense memory nearly learned Bayle's Dictionary by heart. But his letters to Thrasybulus, the offspring of his Atheism, shows that his vast memory was more than outweighed by his want of judgment.

\* D'Alembert and Voltaire ridiculed all those vain systems of Bailly and Buffon on the antiquity of the world and of its inhabitants. They would call these systems, *Nonsense, Follies, an Excuse for the want of Genius, Shallow Ideas, Vain and ridiculous Quackery* (Letter to Voltaire, 6th March 1777); but D'Alembert took care to keep his opinions secret on this subject. By discrediting these systems he feared lest he should discourage those adepts whom he had sent to forge new ones in the Appenines, in order to give the lie to Moses and the sacred writ.

The



The second was Boulanger, whose brain over-  
 burdened with Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac and <sup>Boulanger.</sup>  
 Arabic, had also adopted all the extravagancies  
 of Atheism; but retracted in the latter part of his  
 life, execrating the sect that had misled him. We  
 shall soon see that all those posthumous works at-  
 tributed to these writers, were never written by  
 them.

Fain would the Marquis D'Argens have figured <sup>Marquis</sup>  
 among the *learned* Sophisters; but his *Chinese and* <sup>D'Argens</sup>  
*Cabalistic Letters*, and his *Philosophy of Good Sense*,  
 only prove, that to Bayle's Dictionary he was in-  
 debted for his pretended reputation. He was a  
 long while a friend of Frederick's, and his impiety  
 entitled him to that friendship. It is from his  
 brother, the President D'Eguille, that we have  
 learned, that after several discussions on religion,  
 with persons better versed in that science than  
 Frederick, he submitted to the light of the Gospel,  
 and ardently wished to <sup>atone</sup> ~~do satisfaction~~ for his past  
 incredulity.

As to La Metrie the doctor, if he appeared to <sup>La Me-</sup>  
 rave, it was only from the sincerity of his heart. <sup>trie.</sup>  
 His *man-machine*, or his *man-plant*, only caused the  
 sect to blush from the open manner in which he  
 had said, what many of them wished to insinuate.

Down to the first days of the revolution, the <sup>Marmon-</sup>  
 Sophisters conspiring against their God, thought <sup>tel.</sup>  
 they could glory in the talents and co-operation of  
 Marmontel.

Marmontel. But let us not add to the sorrows of the man, who needed only the first days of the revolution, to shrink with horror from those conspiracies which had given it birth. Of all the Sophisters, who have outlived Voltaire, Mr. de Marmontel is the one who most wished to hide his former intimacy with the Antichristian chiefs. But alas, it is to those connections that he owes his celebrity far more than to his *Incas*, his *Belisarius* or to his *Fables*, intermingled with Philosophism. We could wish to hide it, but Voltaire's own letters convict the repenting adept of having acted, and that during a long time, a very different part among the conspirators. Voltaire was so well convinced of Mr. de Marmontel's zeal, that thinking himself on the point of death, he bequeathed La Harpe to him. This last will is worded thus, "I recommend La Harpe to you, when I am no more ;  
 " *he will be one of the pillars of our church.* You  
 " must have him received of the academy. After  
 " having gained so many prizes, it is but just that  
 " he should bestow them in his turn \*."

**LaHarpe.** With a taste for literature, and some talents, which in spite of his critics, distinguish him above the common rank of the writers of the day, Mr. de la Harpe might have rendered his works useful had he not, from his youth, been the spoilt child

\* Voltaire to Marmontel, 21st Aug. 1767.

of Voltaire. At that age, it is easy to believe one's self a philosopher, when one disbelieves one's catechism, and the young La Harpe blindly followed the instructions of his master. If he never was the pillar, he might be correctly styled the trumpeter of the new church, by means of the *Mercure*, a famous French journal, which by its encomiums, or its weekly criticisms, nearly decided the fate of all literary productions \*.

The encomiums which Voltaire lavished on that journal, after La Harpe had undertaken the direction of it, show how little governments are aware of the influence of such journals over the public opinion. Above ten thousand people subscribed, and many more perused the *Mercure*; and influenced by its suggestions, they by degrees became as philosophic, or rather impious, as the hebdomadary Sophister himself. The conspirators saw what advantage could be reaped from this li-

\* We learn, by the public newspapers, that Mr. de la Harpe was converted, when in prison, by the Bishop of St. Brioux. I should be little surprised at it. The examples of this prelate, with the fruits of Philosophism in this revolution, must strongly impress the man who, with a sound judgment, can compare them with the lessons and promises of his former masters. If the news of this conversion be true, I shall have shown him consecrating his talents to error, and nobody will applaud him more than myself, in seeing him direct them in future towards truth alone.

terary

terary dominion. La Harpe ruled the sceptre during many years, then Marmontel jointly with Champfort, as Remi who was little better, had held it before them. I one day asked the latter, how it was possible, that he had inserted in his journal, one of the wickedest and falsest accounts possible, of a work purely literary, and of which I had heard him speak in the highest terms. He answered me, that the article alluded to had been written by a friend of D'Alembert's, and that he owed his journal, his fortune even to D'Alembert's protection. The injured author wished to publish his defence in the same journal, but it was all in vain. — Let the reader judge from thence how powerfully the periodical papers contributed to the designs of the conspirators, and it was by them that the public mind was chiefly directed to their desired object.

This sect disposed of reputations by their praises or their critics, as it best suited them. By these journals they reaped the two-fold advantage of pointing out to those writers, who hungered after glory or bread \*, what subjects they were to investigate ;

\* The Sophisters were so well acquainted with the powers of a journal, that they mustered up their highest protections against the religious authors who would dispute one with them. When Voltaire was informed that Mr. Clement was to succeed to Mr. Freron, whose pen had long been consecrated

vestigate, and of calling by means of their literary trump, the attention of the public only on those works, which the sect wished to circulate, or had nothing to fear from.

By such artifices, the La Harpes of the day forwarded the conspiracy as much if not more, than the most active of the Sophisters, or their most impious writers. The sophistical author would mingle or condense his poison in his productions, whilst the journalist adept would proclaim it, and infuse it throughout the capital, or into all parts of the empire. The man, who would have remained ignorant of the very existence of an impious or a seditious work, the man, who would have neither spent his time nor his money, on such productions, imbibed the whole of their poison from the perfidious extracts made by the sophistical journalist.

Above all the adepts, far more than Voltaire himself, did a fiend called Condorcet, hate the son of his God. At the very name of the Deity, the monster raged, and it appeared as if he wished to revenge on heaven, the heart it had given him. Cruel and ungrateful, the cool assassin of friendship and of his benefactors, he would willingly have

crated to the vindication of truth, he did not blush at sending D'Alembert to the chancellor in hopes of hindering Mr. Clement from continuing Freron's journal. (Let. 12th Feb. 1773).

VOL. I.

U

directed

directed the dagger against his God, as he did against La Rochefoucault. Atheism was but folly in La Metrie, madness in Diderot, but in Condorcet, it was the phrenzy of hatred and the offspring of pride. It was impossible to convince Condorcet, that any thing but a fool could believe in God. Voltaire, who had seen him when a youth, little foresaw what services he was to render to the conspiracy, even when he wrote, "My great consolation in dying is, that you support the honor of our poor Velches, in which you will be well seconded by Condorcet \*!"

It could not have been on the talents of this man, that the premier rested his hopes. Condorcet had learned as much geometry as D'Alembert could teach him; but as to the Belles Lettres, he was not even of the second class. His style was that of a man who did not know his own language, and his writings, like his sophisms, required much study to be understood. But hatred did for him what nature has done for others. Perpetually plodding at his blasphemies, he at last succeeded in expressing them more clearly; for the amazing difference which is observable between his former and his latter works, can only be explained after that manner. It is more remarkable in his posthumous work on the human mind, where

\* Let. to D'Alembert, No. 101, anno 1773.

his

his pen can hardly be traced, excepting in a few passages, though his genius haunts every page. There he is to be seen, as during his life time, in his studies, in his writings or conversation, directing every thing towards Atheism, seeking no other object in this work, than to inspire his readers with his own frantic hatred against his God. Long since had he waited for the downfall of the altar, as the only sight his heart could enjoy. He beheld it, but was soon to fall himself. His end was that of the impious man, a vagabond and wanderer, sinking under pain misery and the dread of Robespierre, without acknowledging the hand of God, that struck him by that of the ferocious dictator. Alas, if he died as he lived, will not the first instants of his conviction and repentance be those, when he shall hear that God, whom he blasphemed and denied, confessed by the mouths of those awful victims of eternal vengeance!!

During his lifetime, so great was his hatred, that adopting error, in order to rid men of that fear of an immortal God in heaven, he did not hesitate in hoping that his philosophism would one day render men immortal upon earth. To belie Moses and the prophets, he became himself the prophet of madness. Moses had shown the days of man decreasing unto the age at which God had fixed them, and the royal prophet had declared the days of man to extend from sixty to

U 2

seventy,

seventy, and at the most to eighty years, after which all was trouble and pain. And to the oracles of the Holy Ghost, Condorcet would oppose his ! When he calculates his philosophic revolution, which begins by dragging so many to their graves, he adds to the creed of his impiety, that of his extravagancies ; and without hesitation he pronounces that, “ *we are to believe that the life of man must perpetually encrease*, if physical revolutions do not obstruct it. That we are ignorant of the extreme term, which it is never to exceed. We do not even know, *whether nature in its general laws* has fixed that extreme term !” Thus in his pretended *Philosophic Sketch of the Progress of the human Mind* \*, after having built his entire history on the hatred of Christ, and left no hopes to man but in Atheism, we see this Sophister of falsehood, setting up for a prophet, and foreseeing all the fruits of his triumphant philosophy. It is in the very moment of the overthrow of the altar, that he tells us, that henceforth the days of man shall be lengthened, and that in lieu of an eternal God in heaven, man may become immortal on earth, as if at the very moment of its triumph, Philosophism, and the pride of the whole sect, were to be humbled through the extravagancies of the most impious and dearest of its adepts. A life

\* Epoch 10th, page 382.

wholly



wholly spent in blasphemy, could never have but frenzy for its end.

This name of Condorcet, will appear again in these memoirs, and we shall see him hating kings nearly as much as he did his God. Helvetius, and many others before him, had fallen a victim to this double hatred, though their hearts seemed capable of neither.

The unfortunate Helvetius, the child of a virtuous father, followed his steps till beyond his early youth. An exemplary piety had been the fruits of a good education, when he became acquainted with Voltaire. He at first sought him as a master, and his love for poetry had inspired him with admiration for him. Such was the origin of their intimacy, and never was connection more perfidious. In lieu of poetry, impiety constituted his lectures, and in the space of one year, Voltaire transforms his pupil into a more impious and determined Atheist than he was himself. Helvetius was rich, and is at once actor and protector. Laying aside the Gospel, like the generality of the Sophisters, who while they pretend to superior understanding, in crediting the mysteries of Revelation not only believe in all the absurdities of Atheism, but are the sport of their own puerile credulity in all that can be turned against religion. Helvetius's work on the *Spirit*, and which Voltaire calls *Matter*, is filled with ridicu-

culous stories, and fables which he gives for truths, and which are all beneath criticism. This is nevertheless the work of a man who pretends to reform the universe, but who equally disgusts his readers by the licentiousness and obscenity of his morals, and by the absurdity of his materialism.

Helvetius also wrote on *Happiness*, but appears himself to have been a perfect stranger to it. In spite of all his philosophy, he was so tender to the best-founded censure, that he lost his rest, went a travelling, and only returned to brood over the hatred he had vowed to kings and the church. Naturally of a good and gentle disposition, his work on *Man and his Education*, proves how much Philosophism had altered that disposition. There he gives full scope to the grossest calumny and abuse, and denies daily facts, the most publicly attested\*.

I have

\* I would willingly have acquitted Helvetius of this posthumous work, by saying, that it might have been an offspring of that same committee, which had fathered so many other impious works on the dead. But then Voltaire could not have mentioned that work to his brethen at Paris, as one that they must be acquainted with. In three successive letters, he attributes it to Helvetius. He censures him on history, as we have done, and D'Alembert, who could not be ignorant of its author, does not undeceive him. The shame then of this work, must attach to Helvetius. This man writes, in a city where its archbishop, and its pastors were remarkable for their

I have already spoken of RAYNALD ; it is not worth our while to call DESLISLE from the oblivion which both he and his work on the *Philosophy of Nature*, have so long been buried in. Still less that ROBINET and his book of *Nature*, which is only remembered on account of his strange explanations of the intellect by *oval fibres* ; of memory by *undulated or spiral fibres* ; of will by *fretted fibres* ; pleasure and pain by *bundles of sensibility*, and learning by *bumps in the understanding*, and a thousand such like vagaries, still more ridiculous if possible \*.

I shall mention TOUSSAINT, as this man shows to what a height Atheism raged among the conspirators. He had undertaken the part of the corruption of morals. Under the mask of moderation, he succeeds by telling youth, that *nothing was to be feared from love*, this passion *only perfecting them*. That between man and woman *that was a suffi-*

their care and charity to the poor, that the clergy were so hard-hearted that the poor were never seen to beg an alms of them ; and it was in that same city where the rectors were perpetually seen surrounded by, and alleviating the distresses of those same poor. (See his work on Man, &c.) Such were the calumnies his hatred invented, though contradicted by daily facts. He might have said, with more truth, that many applied for alms, to ecclesiastics and religious houses, when they dared not ask them elsewhere.

\* Of Nature, vol. the 1st, book 4th, chap. 2, &c. &c.

† On Morals, part 2 and 3.

U 4

cient

cient claim on each other without matrimony \*. *That children are not more beholden to their fathers for their birth, than for the champagne they had drunk, or the minuet they had been pleased to dance †.* That vengeance being incompatible with God, the wicked had nothing to fear from the punishments of another world ‡. Notwithstanding all this doctrine, the conspirators looked upon him as a timid adept, because he owned a God in heaven, and a soul in man; and to punish him they styled him the *Capuchin Philosopher*. Happily for him he took a better way of punishing them, by abandoning their cause and recanting from his errors ||.

In vain should I name a croud of other writers of the sect. Voltaire had so perfectly brought these Antichristian productions into fashion, that this species of literature was the resource and livelihood of those miserable scribblers, who fed upon their traffic in blasphemy. Holland in particular, that miry bog, where the demon of avarice, enthroned under the auspices of a few booksellers, for a doit would have made over every soul, every religion to impiety, was the grand asylum of these starving infidels. Marc Michel appears to have been the bookseller, who bought their blasphemies

\* On Morals, part 2 and 3. † Ibid, part 3, article 4.

‡ Ibid. part 2, sec. 2.

|| See his Expostulations on the Book of MORALS.

at the highest price. He kept in his pay one Laurent, a monk, who had taken refuge at Amsterdam, and is the author of the *portable divinity*, and so many other impious works recommended by Voltaire, in short, of the *Compere Matbieu*. This monk had other co-operators, whom Marc Michel paid by the sheet. It is Voltaire himself who gives us this account, and these are the works he perpetually recommends the circulation of, as those of a philosophy which diffused a new light to the universe \*.

We shall soon see the presses of the secret confraternity vying with those of Holland, in the deluging of Europe, with these vile productions. Their immense number brought them into such repute, that many years before the revolution, there was not a petty poet, not a novel writer, but must needs pay his tribute to the Philosophism of impiety; one would have thought that the whole art of writing and of getting readers, consisted in epigrams and sarcasms against religion; that all sciences, even the most foreign to religion, had equally conspired against the God of Christianity.

\* Let. to the Count D'Argental, 26th Sept. 1761. To D'Alembert, 13th Jan. 1768. To Mr. Desbordes, 4th Apr. 1768.

The

The history of mankind was transformed into the art of distorting facts, and of directing them against Christianity and Revelation; Physics or the history of Nature, into anti-Mosaic systems. Medicine had its atheism, and Petit taught it at the schools of surgery. La Lande and Dupui imbibed their lectures on astronomy with it, while others introduced it even into grammar; and Condorcet, proclaiming this progress of Philosophism, exults in seeing it *descend from the northern thrones into the universities*\*. The young men walking in the footsteps of their masters, carried to the bar all those principles, which our romancing lawyers were to display in the Constituent Assembly. On leaving the college, the attorneys clerks, or those of a counting-house, only seemed to have learned their letters in order to articulate the blasphemies of Voltaire or Jean Jaques. Such was the rising generation, who since the expulsion of their former masters, were to be found prepared for the grand revolution. Hence arose the Mirabeaux and Brissots, the Caras and Garats, the Merciers and Cheniers. Hence in a word, all that class of French literators, who appear to have been universally carried away by the torrent of the French Revolution.

\* See his artful edition of Pascal, Advertisement, page 5.

An apostacy so universal does not prove that literature and science are préjudicial in themselves, but it shews that men of letters, destitute of religion, are the most dangerous subjects in the state. It is not absolutely in that class that a Robespierre and a Jourdan is found ; but it can afford a Petion or a Marat. It can afford principles, sophisms, and a morality, which terminate in Robespierres or in Jourdans ; and if these latter murder a Bailly, terrify a Marmontel, and imprison a La Harpe, they only terrify, murder, or imprison their progenitors. •

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Conduct of the Clergy towards the Antichristian Conspirators.*

WHILST apostacy bore sway in the palaces of the great, in the Schools of science, and that all the higher classes of citizens were led away from the worship of their religion, some by example, others by the artful sophisms of the conspirators, the duties of the clergy could not be doubtful. It was they who were to oppose a bank to the fetid torrent of impiety, and save the multitude from being swept away by its waters. Far more than its honor or its interest, its very name called on the clergy by the most sacred ties of duty and of conscience, to guard the altar against the attacks of the conspirators. The least backwardness in the combat would have added treason to apostacy. Let the historian who dared speak the truth on kings, be true on the merits of his own body, and whether it redounds to the honor or disgrace of his brethren, let him speak the truth. Hence the future clergy will learn the line of conduct they are to follow, from what has been done.

The



The conspiracy against Christ is not extinct, it may be hidden; but should it burst forth anew, must not the pastor know how far his conduct may influence or retard its progress?

If under the name of Clergy, were comprehended all those who in France wore the half-dress of the church, all that class of men who in Paris, and some of the great towns, styled themselves Abbés, history might reproach the clergy with traitors and apostates, from the first dawn of the conspiracy. We find the Abbé de Prades the first apostate, and happily first to repent. The Abbé Morellet, whose disgrace is recorded in the repeated praises of Voltaire and D'Alembert \*. The Abbé Condilhac, who was to sophisticate the morals of his royal pupil, and particularly that Abbé Raynald, whose name alone is tantamount to twenty demoniacs of the sect.

Paris swarmed with those Abbés; we still say, the Abbé Barthelemi, the Abbé Beaudeau, again the Abbé Noel, the Abbé Syeyes. But the people on the whole, did not confound them with the clergy. They knew them to be the offspring of avarice, seeking the livings but laying the duties of the church aside, or through œcono-

\* Letter to D'Alembert, No. 65, anno 1760. To This riot, 26th Jan. 1762.

my

my adopting the dress while they dishonored it by their profligacy and irreligious writings. The numbers of these amphibious animals, and particularly in the metropolis, may be one of the severest reproaches against the clergy. However great the distinctions made between these and the latter may have been, the repeated scandals of the former, powerfully helped the conspiracy, by their laying themselves open to satire, which retorted upon the whole body, and affected the real ministers of the altar. Many of these Abbés who did not believe in God, had obtained livings through means of the Sophisters, who by soliciting dignities for their adepts, sought to introduce their principles, and dishonor the clergy by their immorality. It was the plague they spread in the enemy's camp, and not daring to face them in the field, they sought to poison their springs.

Conduct  
of the  
true cler-  
gy, and  
what may  
be object-  
ed against  
them.

If under the title of Clergy we only comprehend those who really served at the altar, the conspirators never prevailed against them. I have searched their records, I have examined whether among the bishops and functionary clergy, any of these adepts were to be found, who could be classed with the conspiring Sophisters. Antecedent to the Perigords, D'Autuns, or the apostacy of the Gobets, Gregoires, and other constitutionalists, I only meet with the name of Briennes, and one Judas seated in the College of the Apostles during the

the space of thirty years should suffice \*. That Messier, rector of Etrépigny in Champagne might be added, were it certain that his impious *Last Will and Testament*, was not a forgery of the Sophisters, attributed to him after his death.

In the times when the revolution drew near Philosophism attached itself to the convents of men and soon produced Dom Gerles and his con-

\* It is true that Voltaire in his correspondence, sometimes flatters himself with the protection of the Cardinal de Bernis, who was then but the youthful favorite of the Marquise de Pompadour, or the slender poet of the Graces. The mistakes of a young man are not sufficient to prove his concert with conspirators, whom he never after supported unless in the expulsion of the Jesuits. But could not what D'Alembert said of the parliaments apply to him, "For- give them, Lord, for they know not what they do, nor whose commands they obey." D'Alembert writes in a quite other style, when he speaks of Briennes; he shews him acting the most resolute part of a traitor, in support of the conspiracy, and simply hiding his game from the clergy. (See particularly letter of the 4th and 21st Dec. 1770).

I found some few letters also, mentioning the Prince Lewis de Rohan, seconding their intrigues on the reception of Marmontel at the academy, condescending, as D'Alembert says, from *Coadjutor of a Catholic Church*, to become the *Coadjutor of Philosophy*. (Let. 8th Dec. 1763). If such an error in a prince, naturally noble and generous, proves that he was mistaken in thinking that he barely protected literature, in the person of an adept, it does not for that prove him to have been initiated into the secrets of those who abused his protection, and ended by sporting with his person.

federates,

federates, but this belonged to a different class of conspirators, who are to be the future object of our Memoirs. At all times the body of the clergy preserved the purity of its faith, a distinction might have been made between the zealous edifying ecclesiastics, and the lax not to say scandalous ones; but that of believing and unbelieving could never stand. Never could the conspirators exult in this latter distinction. Would they not have availed themselves of their decreasing faith, as they did of the incredulity of the ministers of Geneva \*. On the contrary, nothing but the most scurrilous abuse is uttered against the clergy for their zeal in support of Christianity, and the satire of the Sophisters redounds to their immortal honor.

The purity of faith alone was not sufficient in the clergy; examples far more powerful than lessons, were necessary to oppose the torrent of impiety. It is true that in the greater part of their pastors the people beheld it in an eminent degree, but the majority will not suffice. Those who are acquainted with the powers of impression, know but too well, that one bad ecclesiastic does more harm than a hundred of the most virtuous can do good. All should have been zealous but many were lax. There were among those who served

\* See the Encyclopedia, article GENEVA; and letter of Voltaire to Mr. Vernes.

the

the altars men unworthy of the sanctuary. These were ambitious men, who owing good example to their diocesses preferred the intrigues and pomp of the capital. It is true that such a conduct could not have constituted vice in the worldling, but what may be light in the world, is often monstrous in the church. The Sophisters in particular with their morals, were not authorised to reprobate those of the delinquent clergy. Where is the wonder that some few unworthy members should have intruded on the sanctuary, when the enemies of the church had possessed themselves of its avenues, in order to bar the preferment of those, whose virtues or learning they dreaded; how could it be otherwise, when the bishops wishing to repel an unworthy member, Choiseul answered, "Such are the men we want and will have :"—or when the irreligious nobleman only beheld in the riches of the church, the inheritance of a son not less vicious than his father.

The clergy might certainly have thus replied to their enemies. And true it is, that if any thing could astonish history, it is not, that with all these intrigues and ambition, some few bad pastors had been intruded on the church, but rather that so many good ones, worthy of their titles, yet remained. But the crimes of the first instigators, does not excuse the scandals of those pastors who gave it. Let the future clergy find

VOL. I.

X

this

this avowal recorded, let those men be acquainted with whatever influenced the progress of the Antichristian Revolution, whose duty essentially militates against that progress, and renders the least pretext given, criminal in them.

Their resistance to impiety.

But history must also declare, that if the remissness of some few may have been a pretence for the conspirators, that the majority made a noble stand against them, and though some few spots could be found, the body was nevertheless splendid with the light of its virtues, which shone forth with redoubled lustre, when impiety at length, strong in its progress, threw off the mask. Then rising above its powers the clergy are not to be intimidated by death, or the rigors of a long exile, and the Sophister unwillingly blushed at the calumnies he had spread, when he represented those men as more attached to the riches than to the faith of the church. Their riches remained in the hands of the banditti, while that faith crowns the archbishops, bishops and ecclesiastics butchered at the Carmes, or consoles those who have found a refuge in foreign countries, from the armies and bloody decrees of the Jacobins. Every where poor, and living on the beneficence of those countries, but powerfully rich in the purity of their faith and testimony of their consciences.

But

But the clergy had not waited these awful days to oppose the principles of the conspirators. From the first days of the conspiracy we can trace their opposition; scarce had impiety raised its voice when the clergy sought to confound it: the Encyclopedia was not half printed when it was proscribed in their assemblies; nor has a single one been held for these fifty years past, which has not warned the throne and the magistracy of the progress of Philosophism\*.

At the head of the prelates who opposed it, we find Mr. de Beaumont archbishop of Paris, whose name history could not pass over without injustice; generous as an Ambrose, he was fired with his zeal and steadiness against the enemies of the faith. The Jansenists obtained his exile, and the Antichristians would willingly have sent him to the scaffold; but there would he have braved their poignards, as he did the Jansenists; when returning from his exile, he might be said to have acquired new vigor to oppose them both.

Many other bishops following his example, to the most unblemished morals, added their pastoral instructions. Mr. de Pompignan then Bishop of Puy refuted the errors of Voltaire and Jean Jaques; the Cardinal de Luynes warned his flock against the *System of Nature*; the Bishops of Bou-

\* See the acts of the clergy since the year 1750.

logne, Amiens, Auch and many others, more powerfully edified their dioceses by their example even than by their writings, nor did there pass a single year, but what some bishop combated the increasing progress of the impious conspirators.

If the sophistry of the sect continued its ravages, it was not the fault of the bishops or the religious writers. The Sorbonne exposed it in their censures. The Abbé Bergier victoriously pursues Deism in its very last retrenchments, and makes it blush at its own contradictions. To the sophisticated learning of the conspirators, he opposed a more loyal application and a truer knowledge of antiquity and of the weapons it furnished to religion\*. The Abbé Guénée with all that urbanity and attic salt which he was master of, obliges Voltaire to humble himself at the sight of his own ignorance and false criticism of sacred writ†. The Abbé Gerard had found a method of sanctifying novels themselves. Under the most engaging forms, he reclaims youth from vice and its tortuous ways, and restores history to its primitive truth. The Abbé Pey had searched all the monuments of the church to reinstate it in its real rights, and under the simple form of a catechism, we see the Abbé Feller, or Flexier

\* His Deism refuted, and his Answer to Freret.

† Letters of some Portuguese Jews.

Dureval,



Dureval, uniting every thing that reason, truth or science can oppose against the Sophisters.

Prior to all these champions of the faith, the Abbé Duguet had victoriously vindicated the principles of Christianity, and the Abbé Houteville had demonstrated the truth of it from history. From the first dawn of the conspiracy, the Pere Berthier and associates had, in the *Journal de Trevoux*, particularly exposed the errors of the Encyclopedists. In fine if the Celfi and Porphirii were numerous, religion had not lost its Justins or its Origenes. In these latter times as in the primitive days of Christianity, he who sincerely sought after truth must have found it in the victorious arguments of the religious authors, opposed to the sophisms of the conspirators. And it may be said that many points of religion had been placed in a clearer light, than they had been before, by these modern apologists.

The Christian orators seconded their bishops and perpetually called the attention of the people to their danger. The refutation of Philosophism was become the object of their public discourses. The Pere Neuville, and after him Mr. de Senez, in fine, the Pere Beauregard in particular, seem to have been fired by that holy zeal. That sudden inspiration with which he appeared to be seized in the Cathedral Church of Paris, is not yet forgotten; when thirteen years before the

revolution, expounding the different maxims and exposing the plans of modern Philosophism, he makes the vaults of the temple resound with words too shamefully verified by the revolution, and exclaims in a prophetic strain:

“ Yes it is at the king—at the king and at  
 “ religion the philosophers aim their blows.  
 “ They have grasped the hatchet and the ham-  
 “ mer, they only wait the favorable moment to  
 “ overturn the altar and the throne.—Yes, my  
 “ God, thy temples will be plundered and de-  
 “ stroyed; thy festivals abolished; thy sacred name  
 “ blasphemed; thy worship proscribed.—But what  
 “ sounds, Great God, do I hear, what do I  
 “ behold! to the sacred canticles which caused  
 “ the vaults of this temple to resound to thy  
 “ praises, succeed wanton and profane songs!  
 “ And thou infamous Deity of Paganism, impure  
 “ Venus, thou durst advance hither even, and  
 “ audaciously in the place of the living God, seat  
 “ thyself on the throne of the Holy of Holies, and  
 “ there receive the guilty incense of thy new  
 “ adorers.”

This discourse was heard by a numerous audience, carried by their own piety or attracted by the eloquence of the orator; by adepts themselves, who attended in hopes of carping at his expressions; by doctors of the laws whom we were acquainted with, and who often repeated them

them to us, long before we had seen them printed in various publications. The adepts cried out, sedition and fanaticism. The doctors of the law only retracted the severity of their censures after they had seen the prediction completely accomplished.

Such strong cautions from the clergy, and the means they opposed, retarded the progress of the Sophisters, but could not triumph over the conspiracy. It was too deep, the black arts of seduction had been too well planned in the hidden dens of the conspirators. I have still to unfold some of their dark mysteries, and when light shall have shone upon them, with surprise shall the reader ask, not how it was possible, with so much zeal on the part of the clergy, that the altar was overthrown, but on the contrary, how the fall of the temple had been so long delayed?

## CHAP. XVII.

*New and deeper Means of the Conspirators, to seduce  
even the lowest Classes of the People.*

WHEN Voltaire had sworn to annihilate Christianity, he little flattered himself with drawing the generality of nations into his apostacy. His pride is often satisfied with the progress Philosophism had made among those *who governed, or were made to govern, and among men of letters* \* ; for a long time he does not appear to envy Christianity, the inferior classes of society, which he does not comprehend under the appellation of the *better sort*. The facts, we are about to lay before the reader, will show to what new extent, the conspirators sought to carry their impious zeal, and by what artifices Christ was to be deprived of all worship, even from the lowest populace.

Origin of  
the Oeco-  
nomists.

A doctor, known in France by the name of Duquesnai, had so well insinuated himself into the favor of Lewis XV. that the king used to call him his *thinker*. He really appeared to have deeply

\* Let. to D'Alembert, 13th Dec. 1763.

medi-

meditated on the happiness of the subject, and he may have sincerely wished it ; nevertheless he was but a system-maker, and the founder of that sect of Sophisters called Œconomists, because the œconomy and order to be introduced into the finances, and other means of alleviating the distresses of the people, were perpetually in their mouths. If some few of these Œconomists, sought nothing further in their speculations, it is at least certain, that their writers, little hid their hatred for the Christian religion. Their works abound in passages which show their wish of substituting natural religion, at least to the Christian religion and revelation \*. Their affectation of solely speaking of agriculture, administration and œconomy, render them less liable to suspicion, than those conspirators perpetually forwarding their impiety.

Duquesnai and his adepts, had more especially <sup>Their</sup> undertaken to persuade their readers, that the <sup>plan for</sup> country people, and mechanics in towns, were en- <sup>free</sup> schools. <sup>schools.</sup> tirely destitute of that instruction necessary for their professions. That men of this class, unable to acquire knowledge by reading, pined away in an ignorance equally fatal to themselves and to the state. That it was necessary to establish free

\* See the analysis of those works, by Mr. Le Gros, Prevost of St. Louis du Louvre,

schools,

The conspirators support the plan.

schools, and particularly throughout the country, where children could be brought up to different trades, and instructed in the principles of agriculture. D'Alembert, and the Voltarian adepts, soon perceived what advantages they could reap from these establishments. In union with the Economists, they presented various memorials to Lewis XV. in which, not only the temporal but even the spiritual advantages of such establishments, for the people are strongly urged. The king, who really loved the people, embraced the project with warmth. He opened his mind, on the subject, to Mr. Bertin, whom he honored with his confidence, and had entrusted with his privy purse. It was from frequent conversations with this minister, that the memorial from which we extract the following account was drawn up. It is Mr. Bertin himself that speaks.

“ Lewis XV., said that minister, having entrusted me with the care of his privy purse, it was natural that he should mention to me an establishment, of which his Majesty was to defray the expence. I had long since closely observed the different sects of our philosophers; and though I had much to reproach myself as to the practice, I had at least preserved the principles of my religion. I had little doubt of the efforts of the Philosophers to destroy it. I was sensible that they wished to have the directi-  
“ rection

“ rection of these schools themselves, and by that  
“ means, seizing on the education of the people,  
“ under pretence that the bishops and ecclesiastics,  
“ who had hitherto superintended them and their  
“ teachers, could not be competent judges in sub-  
“ jects so little suited to clergymen. I appre-  
“ hended that their object was not so much to give  
“ lessons on agriculture, to the children of hus-  
“ bandmen and trades-people, as to withdraw  
“ them from their habitual instructions on their  
“ catechism, or on their religion.

“ I did not hesitate to declare to the king, that  
“ the intentions of the Philosophers were very  
“ different from his. I know those conspirators,  
“ I said, and beware, Sire, of seconding them.  
“ Your kingdom is not deficient in free schools,  
“ or nearly free ; they are to be found in every  
“ little town, and nearly in every village, and  
“ perhaps they are already but too numerous.  
“ It is not books that form mechanics and plow-  
“ men. The books and masters, sent by these  
“ philosophers, will rather infuse system than in-  
“ dustry, into the country people. I tremble  
“ lest they render them idle, vain, jealous, and  
“ shortly discontented, seditious, and at length re-  
“ bellious. I fear, lest the whole fruit of the ex-  
“ pence, they seek to put your Majesty to, will  
“ be to gradually obliterate, in the hearts of the  
“ people,

“ people, its love for their religion and their  
“ sovereign.

“ To these arguments, I added whatever my  
“ mind could suggest, to dissuade his Majesty. I  
“ advised him, in place of paying and sending  
“ those masters, which the Philosophers had  
“ chosen, to employ the same sums, for multi-  
“ plying the catechists, and in searching for good  
“ and patient men, whom his Majesty, in concert  
“ with the bishops, should support, in order to  
“ teach the poor peasantry the principles of reli-  
“ gion, and to teach it them by rote, as the rec-  
“ tors and curates do to those children who do  
“ not know how to read.

“ Lewis XV. seemed to relish my arguments,  
“ but the philosophers renewed their attacks.  
“ They had people about his person, who never  
“ ceased to urge him, and the king could not per-  
“ suade himself, that his *thinker*, Duquesnai, and  
“ the other Philosophers, were capable of such de-  
“ testable views. He was so constantly beset by  
“ those men, that during the last twenty years of  
“ his reign, in the daily conversations which he  
“ honored me with, I was perpetually employed  
“ in combating the false ideas he had imbibed, on  
“ the OEconomists and their associates.

He disco-  
vers the  
means of  
the con-  
spirators.

“ At length determined to give the king  
“ proof positive that they imposed upon him, I  
“ sought to gain the confidence of those pedlars  
“ who



“ who travel through the country, and expose  
“ their goods to sale in the villages, and at the  
“ gates of country seats. I suspected those in  
“ particular who dealt in books, to be nothing  
“ less than the agents of Philosophism with the  
“ good country folks. In my excursions into  
“ the country, I above all fixed my attention on  
“ the latter. When they offered me a book to  
“ buy, I questioned them what might be the  
“ books they had? Probably Catechisms or  
“ Prayer-books? Few others are read in the vil-  
“ lages? At these words I have seen many smile.  
“ No, they answered, those are not our works;  
“ we make much more money of Voltaire, Dide-  
“ rot, or other philosophic writings. What! says  
“ I, the country people buy Voltaire and Diderot?  
“ Where do they find the money for such dear  
“ works? Their constant answer was, We have  
“ them at a much cheaper rate than Prayer-  
“ books; we may sell them at ten sols (5d.) a  
“ volume, and have a pretty profit into the bar-  
“ gain. Questioning some of them still farther,  
“ many of them owned, that those books cost  
“ them nothing; that they received whole bales of  
“ them, without knowing whence they came, sim-  
“ ply desir'd to sell them in their journeys at the  
“ lowest price.”

Such was the account given by Mr. Bertin,  
and particularly during his retreat at Aix la Cha-  
pelle.

pelle. All that he said of those pedlars perfectly coincides with what I have heard many rectors of small towns and villages complain of. They looked upon these hawking booksellers as the pests of their parishes, and as the agents of the pretended philosophers in the circulation of their impiety.

Lewis XV. warned by the discovery made by his minister, at length was satisfied that the establishment of these schools so much promoted by the conspirators, would only be a new mean of seduction in their hands. He abandoned the plan, but perpetually harassed by the protecting Sophisters, he did not strike at the root of the evil, and but feebly impeded its progress. The pedlars continued to serve the measures of the conspirators, but this was but one of the inferior means employed to supply the delay of their free schools, as a new discovery brought one far more fatal to light.

The  
school-  
masters in  
the vil-  
lages.

Many years prior to the French Revolution, a rector of the diocese of Embrun, had had frequent contests with the school-master of the village, charging him with corrupting the morals of his pupils, and with distributing most irreligious books among them. The lord of the village, one of the protecting adepts, supported the school-master; the good rector applied to his archbishop. Mr. Salabert D'Anguin, Vicar-general, desired to see

see the library of the master. It was filled with these sort of works ; but the delinquent, so far from denying the use he made of them, with a pretended simplicity, said he had always heard those works spoken of in the highest terms ; and, like the hawkers, declared that he was not at the trouble of buying them, as they were sent to him free of all costs.

At about a league from Liege, and in the adjacent villages, masters still more perfidious, carried their means of corruption to a far greater extent. These would assemble a certain number of trades-people and poor country fellows, who had not learned to read, on certain days, at particular hours. In these meetings, one of the pupils of the professor would read in an audible voice, a chapter in some work with which he himself had already been perverted. For example one of Voltaire's romances, then the *Sermon of the Fifty*, the pretended *Good Sense*, or other works of the sect furnished by the master. Those that abounded in calumny and abuse against the clergy, were particularly read. These meetings, the fore-runners of the Liege revolution, were only discovered when an honest and religious carpenter, who worked for a canon of that cathedral, declared the sorrow he had conceived in finding his two sons at one of these meetings reading such lectures to about a dozen of country fellows. On this discovery,

very, a proper search was made in the adjacent country, and many school-masters were found guilty of the same perfidy; and, terrible to say, by the exterior practice of their religion, these men had done away all suspicion of such infernal dealings. The researches were carried still further, and the plots were traced up to D'Alembert; the following was the result of this new discovery. It is the very person to whom the honest carpenter opened his mind, and who made the necessary perquisitions on so important an object, who gave me the following information.

D'Alembert's committee of education.

In seeking what men had been the promoters of these corrupters of youth, they were found to be protected by men whose connexions with the Sophisters of the day, were no secret. At length they were traced to D'Alembert himself, and his office for tutors. It was to this office that all those heretofore mentioned addressed themselves, who wanted the recommendation of the Sophisters to obtain a place of preceptor or tutor in the houses of the great or wealthy. But at this period, private education was not the sole object of D'Alembert. He now had established a correspondence throughout the provinces and beyond the kingdom. Not a place of professor in a college, or of a simple school-master in a village became vacant, but what he or his coadjutors were immediately informed of it by his agents. Also  
of

of the persons who petitioned for these places, of those who should be accepted or rejected, and of the means necessary to be employed, or persons to be applied to, to obtain the nomination of an adept competitor, or of those who were to be sent from Paris; in short, of the proper instructions to be given to the elected with regard to local circumstances, or the more or less progress Philosophy had made around them. Hence the impudence of the school-master in the diocese of Embrun, and that hypocrisy in those of the principality of Liege, where a government totally ecclesiastical was to be feared, and where infidelity had not yet made the same ravages it had in France.

It is thus that D'Alembert, faithful to the mission Voltaire had given him, *to enlighten youth as much as lay in his power* \*, had extended his means of seducing them. Voltaire no longer regretted the colony of Cleves. That *manufacture* of impiety which was to have been its chief object, the philosophic *confraternity*, like to *that of the Freemasons*, the SECRET ACADEMY, more zealous in crushing Christ and his religion, than any other ever had been in the propagation of science or learning, were now established in Paris. And it was in the capital of the Most Christian empire,

\* Letter 15th of Sept. 1762.

that these associations were held, the parents of the revolution that was to bring devastation on France, and destruction on Christianity throughout the world. This was the last *mystery of Mytra*; this was the deepest intrigue of the conspirators; nor do I know that it has been laid open by any writer. In the correspondence of the Sophisters, no trace can be discovered of this intrigue, at least in what the adepts have published. They had their reasons for suppressing such letters; for even in the first days of the revolution, would not the people have been indignant on hearing of such means to wrest their religion from them, and never would such a mystery of iniquity have emerged from the darkness in which it had been conceived, if Providence had not ordained that the unfortunate adept we are about to speak of, tortured with remorse, should make an avowal of it.

Discovery of  
the secret  
academy,  
and of its  
means.

Before we publish his declaration ourselves, it is incumbent on us to say by what means we became acquainted with it, and what precautions we have taken to ascertain the authenticity of it. The honor and probity of the person who gave us the account, placed its veracity beyond all doubt, nevertheless we requested to have it under his signature. Still further, seeing that a great nobleman was mentioned as a witness, and even as the second actor in the scene, we did not hesitate in applying directly to him. This nobleman, of distinguished honor,

honor, virtue and courage, bears the first distinction of French knighthood, and is in London at this present time. We attended to the recital he was pleased to make, and found it perfectly consonant with the signed memorial we had carried with us. If his name is omitted, it is only because he was loath to see it appear in a fact that criminales the memory of a friend, whose error was rather owing to the seduction of the Sophisters than to his own heart, and whose repentance in some sort atoned for the crime he had been guilty of. The following is the fact, which will complete the proofs, as yet only drawn from the letters of the conspirators themselves.

About the middle of the month of September, 1789, that is a little more than a fortnight antecedent to the atrocious 5th and 6th of October, at a time when the conduct of the National Assembly, having thrown the people into all the horrors of a revolution, indicated that they would set no bounds to their pretensions, Mr. Le Roy, Lieutenant of the King's Hunt, and an Academician, was at dinner at Mr. D'Angevilliers, Intendant of the Buildings of his Majesty, the conversation turned on the disasters of the revolution, and on those that were too clearly to be foreseen. Dinner over, the nobleman above mentioned, a friend of Le Roy, but hurt at having seen him so great an admirer of the Sophisters, reproached him

Y 2

with

with it in the following expressive words. *Well, this however is the work of PHILOSOPHY!* Thunder-struck at these words,—Alas! cried the Academician, *to whom do you say so? I know it but too well, and I shall die of grief and remorse!* At the word *remorse*, the same nobleman questioned him whether he had so greatly contributed towards the revolution, as to upbraid himself with it in that violent manner? “Yes, answered he, I have  
 “ contributed to it, and far more than I was aware  
 “ of. I was secretary to the committee to  
 “ which you are indebted for it, but I call heaven to witness, that I never thought it would  
 “ come to such lengths. You have seen me in  
 “ the king’s service, and you know that I love  
 “ his person. I little thought of bringing his subjects to this pitch, *and I shall die of grief and remorse!*”

Avowal  
and  
row of its  
secretary.

Pressed to explain what he meant by this committee, this secret society, entirely new to the whole company, the Academician resumed: “This society was a sort of club that we had  
 “ formed among us philosophers, and only admitted into it persons on whom we could  
 “ perfectly rely. Our sittings were regularly  
 “ held at the Baron D’Holbach’s. Left our object should be surmised, we called ourselves  
 “ Economists. We created Voltaire, though  
 “ absent, our honorary and perpetual president.  
 “ Our



“ Our principal members were D’Alembert,  
 “ Turgot, Condorcet, Diderot, La Harpe, and  
 “ that Lamoignon Keeper of the Seals who, on  
 “ his dismissal, shot himself in his park.”

The whole of this declaration was accompanied with tears and sighs, when the adept, deeply penitent, continued: “ The following were our oc-<sup>Their</sup>cupations; the most of those works which <sup>object.</sup>  
 “ have appeared for this long time past against  
 “ religion, morals and government, were ours, or  
 “ those of authors devoted to us. They were all  
 “ composed by the members or by the orders of  
 “ the society. Before they were sent to the press,  
 “ they were delivered in at our office. There we  
 “ revised and corrected them; added to or cur-  
 “ tailed them according as circumstances required.  
 “ When our philosophy was too glaring for the  
 “ times, or for the object of the work, we  
 “ brought it to a lower tint, and when we thought  
 “ that we might be more daring than the author,  
 “ we spoke more openly. In a word, we made our  
 “ writers say exactly what we pleased. Then the  
 “ work was published under the title or name we  
 “ had chosen, the better to hide the hand whence  
 “ it came. Many supposed to have been posthu-  
 “ mous works, such as *Christianity Unmasked*, and  
 “ divers others, attributed to Freret and Boulan-  
 “ ger, after their deaths, were issued from our  
 “ society.

“ When

“ When we had approved of those works, we  
 “ began by printing them on fine or ordinary  
 “ paper, in sufficient number to pay our expen-  
 “ ces, and then an immense number on the com-  
 “ monest paper. These latter we sent to hawkers  
 “ and booksellers free of costs, or nearly so, who  
 “ were to circulate them among the people at the  
 “ lowest rate. These were the means used to  
 “ pervert the people and bring them to the pre-  
 “ sent state you see them in. I shall not  
 “ see them long, *for I shall die of grief and re-  
 “ morse !*”

This recital had made the company shudder,  
 nevertheless they could not but be struck at the re-  
 morse and horrid situation in which they beheld  
 the speaker. Their indignation for Philosophism  
 was carried still further, when Le Roy explained  
 the meaning of ECR : L'INF (*écrasez l'infame,*  
*crush the wretch*), with which Voltaire concludes  
 so many of his letters. The reader will perceive,  
 that in the whole of these Memoirs we had uni-  
 formly given the same explanation ; and indeed  
 the context of the letters makes the sense evident ;  
 but he revealed what we should not have dared as-  
 sert on our own authority, that all those to whom  
 Voltaire wrote under that horrid formula, were  
 members or initiated into the mysteries of this  
 secret committee. He also declared what we  
 have already said on the plan of elevating Briennes

to

to the archbishopric of Paris, and many other particulars, which he related, and that would have been precious for history, but have escaped the memory of those present. None of them could give me any information as to the exact time when this secret academy was formed; but it appears from the discovery made by Mr. Bertins, that it must have existed long before the death of Lewis XV.

I think it necessary, on this occasion, to lay before my reader a letter of March 1763, which Voltaire writes to Helvetius. "Why, says he to his zealous brother, do the worshippers of reason live in silence and fear? They are not sufficiently acquainted with their own strength. *What should binder them from having a little press of their own, and from publishing small works, short and useful, and which should only be confided to their friends.* This was the method followed by those who printed the last will of the good and honest curate (Meslier), his testimony is certainly of great weight. It is further *certain, that you and your friends could, with the greatest facility, pen the best works possible, and throw them into circulation without exposing yourselves in the least.*"

There also exists another letter, in which Voltaire, under the name of *Jean Patourel*, heretofore a Jesuit, and in his ironic style, seeming to felicitate

citate Helvetius on his pretended conversion, de-  
 scribes the method employed for the circulation of  
 those works, among the lower classes. "In op-  
 " position to the *Christian pedagogue*, and the *Think*  
 " *well on it*, books formerly so much famed for  
 " the conversions they had wrought; pretty little  
 " philosophic works are *cleverly* circulated; these  
 " little books rapidly succeed each other. *They are*  
 " *not sold, they are given to people who can be relied*  
 " *on, who in their turn distribute them, to women and*  
 " *young people.* At one time it is the *Sermon of the*  
 " *fifty*, attributed to the King of Prussia; at ano-  
 " ther an *extract from the will*, of the unfortunate  
 " curate Jean Meslier, who, on his death-bed,  
 " implored forgiveness of his God, for having  
 " taught Christianity, or lastly, *the Catechism of the*  
 " *honest man*, written by a certain Abbé Durand,  
 " (that is Voltaire himself) \*."

These two letters may throw great light on the  
 subject. First, we see Voltaire giving the plan of a  
 secret society, which perfectly coincides with the  
 one described by Le Roi; secondly, that one of a  
 similar nature existed at Ferney; thirdly, that it had  
 not taken place, at the period when these letters were  
 written, as he presses the establishment of it. But  
 on the other side, the pretended posthumous works  
 of Freret and Boulanger, which the adept Le Roi

\* Let. to Helvetius, 25th Aug. 1763.

declares

declares to have been issued from this secret academy, holding its sittings at the Baron D'Holbach's, were published in 1756 and 1757 \*. It therefore appears that this secret committee was established at Paris, between the years 1763 and 1766. That is to say, that for three and twenty years preceding the revolution, they had been incessantly attempting to seduce the people by those artifices and intrigues, the shame of which, drew the above avowal from its repenting secretary. Such would have been the manufacture of Voltaire's colony.

When  
estab-  
lish-  
ed.

It was with truth, that this unhappy adept repeated, *I shall die of grief and remorse*; for he did not survive his avowal three months. When he mentioned the principal members, he added that all those to whom Voltaire wrote under the abominable formula of *Crush the Wretch*, were either members, or initiated into the mysteries of this secret academy.

Other  
adepts of  
the aca-  
demy.

In following this rule the first of these adepts will certainly be Damilaville, who exulted so much on hearing that none but the rabble were left to worship Christ; for it is to him in particular, that Voltaire always ends his letters by, *crush the wretch*. This man was himself very little above that rabble he so much despised. He had made a small

Damila-  
ville.

\* See *L'Antiquité dévoilée*, Amsterdam, anno 1766, and *l'Examen des Apologistes du Christianisme*, anno 1767.

fortune

fortune by being one of the clerks in the office for the tax called the Vingtiemes, and had a salary of about 180l. per ann. His philosophy had not taught him the spirit of poverty, as we see Voltaire excusing himself, on his not having been able to procure him a more lucrative employment \*.

The distinctive character, which Voltaire gives him in one of his letters, is that of *bating God*; could that have given rise to their great intimacy? It was through his means, that he transmitted his most impious productions or particular secrets to the conspirators. We should have remained in the dark, as to his literary talents, had it not been for a letter from Voltaire to the Marquis de Villeville, which so perfectly describes the meanness of the Sophisters, and how distant they were from the true Philosopher, ready to sacrifice every thing in the cause of truth. “ No, my dear friend (says “ Voltaire to the Marquis), the modern Socratefes “ will not drink hemlock. The Athenian Socrates, “ with respect to us, was a very imprudent man, “ an eternal quibbler, and who foolishly set his “ judges at defiance.

“ Our philosophers of these days, are wiser than “ that. They are not possessed with that foolish “ vanity of putting their names to their works. “ They are invisible hands, who, from one end of

\* Gen. Cor. let. to Damilaville, 2d Dec. 1757.

“ Europe

“ Europe to the other, pierce fanaticism with the  
 “ shafts of truth. Damilaville is just dead, he  
 “ was the author of *Christianity unmasked* (which  
 “ he had published as a posthumous work of  
 “ Boulanger’s) and of many other writings. *It*  
 “ *was never known, and his friends kept his secret*  
 “ *with a fidelity worthy of Philosophy* \*.”

Such then is the author of that famous work, which the Sophisters had given us, as flowing from the pen of one of their most learned adepts. Damilaville, under the name of Boulanger, from his publican-office, fallies forth the phœnix of modern Philosophism, and with the courage of a Sophister, shrinks from his own works, lest they cost him dearly, if ever called upon to support his principles before the tribunals. He also would have shrunk from the hemlock potion, in the infamy and eternal shame, that such abominable calumnies as he had vomited forth against Christianity, must have overpowered him with.

This adept, so worthy of Voltaire’s and D’Alembert’s friendship, died a bankrupt clerk in office, and had been parted from his wife, for the last twelve years. Voltaire is his panegyrist when he says, “ I shall always regret Damilaville, I  
 “ loved the intrepidity of his soul, he was enthu-

• 20th Dec. 1768.

“ stastic

“fiasitic like St. Paul, he was a necessary man \*.”  
Decency forbids us to quote the remainder of the panegyric.

Count  
D’Ar-  
gental.

Next to this Sophister, whose chief merits appear to have been his enthusiastic Atheism, we find the Count D’Argental. I have already spoken of his intimacy with Voltaire, and only mention him, as one of those initiated in the secret mysteries of the secret academy; being one of those correspondents with whom Voltaire expresses himself in the most unreserved manner on his plan of crushing Christ †.

Thiriot.

On the same claim a sort of scribbler called Thiriot is to be aggregated to the academy. Neither more elevated than Damilaville in rank or fortune; he for a longer time subsisted on Voltaire’s benefactions, who first made him his disciple and then his agent. Brother Thiriot added ingratitude to his impiety, and Voltaire complained bitterly of him. But Thiriot notwithstanding his ingratitude, always remained impious, which reconciled him to Voltaire and preserved him within the fraternal embrace of the conspirators ‡.

\* 23d December 1769, 13th of January, &c.

† See numbers of letters in the General Correspondence.

‡ See Correspondence and Letters to D’Alembert, and letters from the Marchioness of Chatellet to the King of Prussia.

It



It is with concern that Mr. Saurin is seen a Saurin. member of this academy. Certainly it is not his literary works which raise this sentiment, for were it not for his Tragedy of Spartacus, both his prose and verse, would equally be forgotten; but we are told that it was rather to his want of fortune, than to his disposition, that he owed his connexions with the Sophisters. He is even said to have been a man of great probity, but that he was drawn into that society, for the consideration of a pension of a thousand crowns which Helvetius paid him. What an excuse! And where is the probity of the man who will sacrifice his religion to his interest; and for a pension coalesce with those who conspire against his God? We see Voltaire writing to Saurin himself, and placing him on the same line with Helvetius and the initiated brethren, entrusting him with the same secrets, and exhorting him to the same warfare against Christ. As we have never seen him disclaim the connexion, the shame of it must attach to him\*.

A Swiss Baron of the name of Grimm must Grimm. necessarily find his place here. He was the worthy friend and co-operator of Diderot, like him travelling to Petersbourg to form adepts, then returning to Paris, he also joins in his absurdities,

\* Voltaire to Mr. Saurin, anno 1761; and to Damilaville, 28th December 1762.

repeats

repeats after him, that *between a man and his dog there is no other difference but their dress*, and exults in being able to apprise Voltaire, that the Emperor Joseph II. was initiated into his mysteries.

Baron  
D'Hol-  
bach.

We will terminate our list by the German Baron D'Holbach, who destitute of abilities lends his house. He had acquired at Paris, the reputation of a lover and protector of the arts, nor did the Sophisters contribute a little to it. This was a cloak to their meetings at his house. Unable to vie with the poet he wishes to be the Mæcenas. Nor is he the only person who has owed his reputation to his purse, and to his having disposed of it in favor of the Sophisters. In spite of these pretences, sought for coloring the frequent meetings of the adepts, the public repute of those who resorted to his house, had thrown such an odium on him, that it was openly said, that to gain admittance at his house, it was necessary, as in Japan, to trample on the cross.

Such then were the members of this famous academy, whose sole object was to corrupt the minds of the people and prepare the way to universal apostacy, under the pretext of their happiness, public œconomy, or the love and advancement of the arts. Here are fifteen of its members which we have mentioned, Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, Helvetius, Turgot, Condorcet, La Harpe, the keeper of the seals Lamoignon, Damilaville, Thiriot,

Thiriot, Saurin, the Count D'Argental, Grimm, the Baron D'Holbach, and the unfortunate Le Roi, who died consumed with grief and remorse, for having been the secretary to so monstrous an academy.

If at present we ascend back to the real founder of this academy, to Voltaire's letter to Helvetius, already quoted, the following one to D'Alembert should be added: " Let the Philosophers unite  
 " in *a brotherhood like the Free-Masons*, let them  
 " assemble and support each other; let them be  
 " faithful to the association. Then I would let  
 " myself be burnt for them. This SECRET ACADEMY will be far superior to that of Athens,  
 " and to all those of Paris. But every one thinks  
 " only for himself, and forgets that his most sacred  
 " duty is to *crush the wretch*." This letter is dated 20th of April 1761. Confronting it with the declaration of Le Roi, we see how faithfully the Parisian adepts had followed the plans of the premier chief. Often did he lament his inability of presiding over their toils but at a distance; and it was difficult to persuade him, that the capital of the most Christian empire, was a proper seat for so licentious an establishment. It was for that reason we see him pursuing his favorite plan of the philosophic colony, even after the establishment of the secret academy. But the time came when the direful success of the latter more than  
 com-

compensated the loss of the former. Triumphant in Paris and surrounded by the adepts, he was one day to reap the fruits of such unrelenting constancy in the warfare he waged during the last half century against his God.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of the General Progress of the Conspiracy throughout Europe.—Triumph and Death of the Chiefs.*

AS the conspirators advanced in their arts of seduction, their hopes are daily heightened by some new success. They were already such, that a few years after the Encyclopedia had first appeared, we find D'Alembert confidently writing to Voltaire, "Let Philosophy alone, and in twenty years the Sorbonne, however much Sorbonne it may be, will outstrip Lausanne itself." That is to say, that in twenty years time (and this was written 21st July 1757), the Sorbonne would be as incredulous and Antichristian as a certain minister of Lausanne (Voltaire himself) who furnished the most impious articles that are to be found in the Encyclopedia.

Hopes of  
the con-  
spirators.

Soon after, Voltaire improving on D'Alembert, says, twenty years more, *and God will be in a pretty plight* \* ! That is to say, twenty years more, and not an altar of the God of the Christians shall remain.

\* 25th Feb. 1758.

VOL. I.

Z

Every

Their  
progress.

Every thing indeed seemed to forbode the universal reign of impiety throughout Europe. The district which had fallen in particular to Voltaire, was making such an awful progress, that eight

In Swit-  
zerland.

years after he writes, that *not a single Christian was to be found from Geneva to Berne* \*. Every where else, to use his expressions, the *world was acquiring wit apace*, and even so fast, that a general re-

In Ger-  
many.

volution in ideas threatened all around. Germany in particular, gave him great hopes †. Frederick, who as carefully watched it, as Voltaire did Switzerland, writes, that “ philosophy was beginning to “ penetrate even into superstitious Bohemia, and “ into Austria, the former abode of supersti- “ tion ‡.”

In Russia.

In Russia the adepts gave if any thing, still greater hopes. This protection of the *Scythians*, is what consoles Voltaire for the persecutions which beset the sect elsewhere ||. He could not contain himself for joy, when he wrote to D'Alembert how much the brethren were protected at Petersburg, and informed him, that during a journey made by that court, the Scythian protectors had each one, for his amusement, undertaken to translate a chapter of Belisarius into their language : that the Empress had undertaken one herself, and

\* 8th Feb. 1766. † 2d Feb. 1765.

‡ Let. to Voltaire, 143, anno 1766.

|| Let. to Diderot, 25th Dec. 1762.

had

had even been at the trouble of revising the translation of this work, which in France had been censured by the Sorbonne \*.

D'Alembert wrote, that in Spain Philosophism <sup>In Spain.</sup> was *undermining* the Inquisition †, and according to Voltaire, a great *revolution was operating in ideas* there, as well as *in Italy* ‡. A few years after <sup>In Italy.</sup> we find this Italy swarming with men thinking like Voltaire and D'Alembert, and that their sole interest prevented them from openly declaring for impiety ||

As to England they made but little doubt of its <sup>In Eng-</sup> falling an easy prey. To hear them speak, it was <sup>land.</sup> overrun with Socinians who scoffed at and hated Christ, as Julian the apostate hated and despised him, and who only differed in name from the philosophers §.

Finally, according to their calculations, Bavaria and Austria alone (this was during the lifetime of the Empress Queen) continued to support the divines and defenders of religion. The Empress of Russia *was driving them on gloriously*, and they were at *their last gasp in Poland*, thanks to the King Poniatowski. They were *already over-*

\* Voltaire to D'Alembert, July 1767.

† 3d May, 1773.

‡ Let. to Mr. Riche, 1st March 1768.

|| Voltaire to D'Alembert, 16th June 1773.

§ Let. to the King of Prussia, 15th Nov. 1773.

*thrown in Prussia*, through the care of Frederick, and *in the north of Germany* the sect daily gained ground, thanks to the Landgraves, Margraves, Dukes and Princes, adepts and protectors \*.

**In France.** Far otherwise did matters stand in France. We often see the two chiefs complaining of the obstacles they had to encounter in this empire, the favorite object of their conspiracy.

The perpetual appeals of the clergy, the decrees of the parliaments, the very acts of authority which the ministers, though friendly to the conspirators, were obliged to exert in order to hide their predilection, were not totally ineffectual. The bulk of the nation still remained attached to its faith. That numerous class called the people, in spite of all the intrigues of the secret academy, still flocked to the altar on days of solemnity. In the higher classes, numerous were the exceptions to be made of those who still loved religion. Indignant at so many obstacles, Voltaire would perpetually stimulate his countrymen, whom he contemptuously calls his *poor Velches*. Sometimes however he was better pleased with them, and would write to his dear Marquis Villevieille, "*The people are mighty foolish, nevertheless Philosophism makes its way down to them.*" Be well assured for instance, that there are not twenty people in

\* Voltaire to D'Alembert, 1st Sept. 1767.

" Geneva



“ Geneva who would not abjure Calvin as soon  
 “ as they would the Pope, and that many phi-  
 “ losophers are to be found in Paris behind the  
 “ counter \*.” But generally speaking, his com-  
 plaints about France predominate in his correspon-  
 dence with the conspirators ; sometimes he would  
 despair of ever seeing Philosophy triumph there.  
 D’Alembert, on the spot, judged of matters very  
 differently, and though every thing did not answer  
 his wishes, nevertheless he thought himself autho-  
 rised to flatter Voltaire, that though *philosophy*  
*might receive a temporary check, it never could be got*  
*the better of †.*

About the period when D’Alembert writes this,  
 it was but too true that Philosophism could flatter  
 itself with the hopes of triumphing over the attach-  
 ment of the French nation to their religion. Du-  
 ring the last ten or twelve years, impiety had made  
 a dreadful progress, the colleges had sent forth a  
 new generation educated by new masters, and  
 they were nearly void of all knowledge, and par-  
 ticularly destitute of religion or piety. It per-  
 fectly coincided with Condorcet’s expression, that  
 Philosophism *had descended from the thrones of the*  
*North into the very universities ‡.* The religious  
 generation was nearly extinct, and the revealed

\* 20th Dec. 1768.

† 25th Jan. 1776.

‡ See his Preface to his edition of Paschal’s Thoughts.

truths were obliged to give place to the empty sounds of reason, philosophy, prejudices, and such like. In the higher classes impiety made large strides, whether at court or in the tribunals; from the capital it gained the provinces, and the master shows the example to the servant. Every body would be a Philosopher, whether minister or magistrate, soldier or author. He that wished to follow his religion, was exposed to all the sarcastic irony of the Sophisters, and that particularly among the great, where it required as much courage to profess one's religion, since the conspiracy, as it did audacity and rashness to declare one's self an Atheist before.

Triumph  
of Vol-  
taire.

Voltaire was at that time in his eighty-fourth year. After so long an absence, and always under the power and lash of the law, he should only have appeared publicly in Paris, to controvert those impieties, which had brought the animadversion of the parliament on him. D'Alembert and his academy resolve to overcome that obstacle. In spite of religion they easily succeed, and ministers, chiefly adepts, abusing the clemency of Lewis XVI. obtain the recal of this premier chief, under pretence that this aged man had been sufficiently punished by his long exile, and that in favor of his literary trophies, his failings might be over-looked. It was agreed that the laws should be silent with regard to him on his approach to Paris; the magistrates

strates seemed to have forgotten the decree they had passed against him. This was all the conspirators wished. Voltaire arrives in Paris, he receives the homage of the sect, and his arrival constitutes their triumphal day. This man, bending under the weight of years, spent in an unrelenting warfare, whether public or private, against Christianity, is received in the capital of his most Christian Majesty, amidst those acclamations which were wont to announce the arrival of the favorite child of victory returning from the arduous toils of war.

Whithersoever Voltaire bent his steps, a croud of adepts, and the gazing multitude, flocked to meet him. All the academies celebrate his arrival, and they celebrate it in the Louvre, in the palace of the kings, where Lewis XVI. is one day to be a prisoner and victim to the occult and deepest conspiracies of the Sophisters. The theatres decreed their crowns to the impious chief; entertainments in his honor, rapidly succeed each other. Intoxicated with the incense of the adepts, through pride he fears to sink under it. In the midst of these coronations and acclamations, he exclaimed, *You then wish to make me expire with glory!*—Religion alone mourned at this sight, and His death. vengeance hung over his head. The impious man had feared to die of glory, but rage and despair was to forward his last hour still more than

his great age. In the midst of his triumphs, a violent hemorrhage raised apprehensions for his life. D'Alembert, Diderot and Marmontel, hastened to support his resolution in his last moments, but were only witnesses to their mutual ignominy as well as to his own.

Here let not the historian fear exaggeration. Rage, remorse, reproach and blasphemy, all accompany and characterize the long agony of the dying Atheist. This death, the most terrible that is ever recorded to have stricken the impious man, will not be denied by his companions of impiety; their silence, however much they may wish to deny it, is the least of those corroborative proofs, which could be adduced. Not one of the Sophisters has ever dared to mention any sign given, of resolution or tranquillity, by the premier chief, during the space of three months, which elapsed from the time he was crowned at the theatre, until his decease. Such a silence expresses, how great their humiliation was in his death.

It was on his return from the theatre, and in the midst of the toils he was resuming, in order to acquire fresh applause, when Voltaire was warned, that the long career of his impiety was drawing to an end.

In spite of all the Sophisters, flocking around him, in the first days of his illness he gave signs of wishing to return to the God he had so often blasphemed.

phemed. He calls for the priests who ministered to *Him* whom he had sworn to *crush*, under the appellation of *the wretch*. His danger encreasing, he wrote the following note to the Abbé Gaultier.

“ You had promised me, Sir, to come and hear  
 “ me. I intreat you would take the trouble of  
 “ calling as soon as possible. *Signed, VOLTAIRE.*  
 “ Paris, the 26th Feb. 1778.”

A few days after he wrote the following declaration, in presence of the same Abbé Gaultier, the Abbé Mignot and the Marquis de Villevieille, copied from the minutes deposited with Mr. Momet, notary at Paris.

“ I, the underwritten, declare, that for these  
 “ four days past, having been afflicted with a vomiting of blood, at the age of eighty-four, and  
 “ not having been able to drag myself to the  
 “ church, the Rev. the Rector of St. Sulpice,  
 “ having been pleased to add to his good works,  
 “ that of sending to me the Abbé Gaultier, a  
 “ priest ; I confessed to him, and if it pleases God  
 “ to dispose of me, I die in the *Holy Catholic*  
 “ *Church*, in which I was born ; hoping that the  
 “ divine mercy, will deign to pardon all my faults :  
 “ if ever I have scandalized the Church, I ask  
 “ pardon of God and of the Church. 2d March  
 “ 1778. *Signed, VOLTAIRE* : in presence of the  
 “ Abbé Mignot my nephew, and the Marquis de  
 “ Villevieille my friend.”

After

After the two witnesses had signed this declaration, Voltaire added these words, copied from the same minutes: "The Abbé Gaultier, my confessor, having apprized me, that it was said among a certain set of people, I should protest against every thing I did at my death; I declare I never made such a speech, and that it is an old jest attributed, long since, to many of the learned, more enlightened than I am."

Was this declaration a fresh instance of his former hypocrisy? Unfortunately, after the explanations we have seen him give of his exterior acts of religion, might there not be room for doubt? Be that as it may, this is a public homage, paid to that religion in which he declared he meant to die, notwithstanding his having perpetually conspired against it, during his life. This declaration is also signed by that same friend and adept the Marquis de Villevieille to whom eleven years before, Voltaire was wont to write, "*Conceal your march from the enemy in your endeavours to crush the wretch* \*."

Voltaire had permitted this declaration to be carried to the rector of St. Sulpice, and to the Archbishop of Paris, to know whether it would be sufficient. When the Abbé Gaultier returned with the answer, it was impossible for him to gain admittance to the patient. The conspirators had

• 27th April 1767.

strained

strained every nerve to hinder the chief from consummating his recantation, and every avenue was shut to the priest, which Voltaire himself had sent for. The demons haunted every access; rage succeeds to fury, and 'fury to rage again during the remainder of his life. Then it was that D'Alembert, Diderot, and about twenty others of the conspirators, who had beset his apartment, never approached him, but to witness their own ignominy, and often he would curse them and exclaim, "Retire, it is you that have brought  
 " me to my present state; begone, I could have  
 " done without you all, but you could not exist  
 " without me, and what a wretched glory have you  
 " procured me!"

Then would succeed the horrid remembrance of his conspiracy; they could hear him, the prey of anguish and dread, alternatively supplicating or blaspheming that God whom he had conspired against, and in plaintive accents would he cry out, Oh Christ! Oh Jesus Christ! And then complain that he was abandoned by God and man. The hand which had traced in ancient writ the sentence of an impious revelling king, seemed to trace before his eyes CRUSH THEN, DO CRUSH THE WRETCH. In vain he turned his head away, the time was coming apace when he was to appear before the tribunal of him he had blasphemed, and his  
 physicians,

physicians, particularly Mr. Tronchin, calling in to administer relief, thunderstruck retire, declaring the death of the impious man to be terrible indeed. The pride of the conspirators would willingly have suppressed these declarations, but it was in vain: the Marechal de Richelieu flies from the bed-side declaring it to be a sight too terrible to be sustained, and Mr. Tronchin, that the furies of Orestes could give but a faint idea of those of Voltaire.

Thus died on the 30th of May 1778, rather worn out by his own fury than by the weight of years, the most unrelenting conspirator against Christianity, that had been seen since the time of the apostles. His persecution longer and more perfidious than those of Nero or Dioclesian had YET only produced apostates, but they were more numerous than the martyrs made in the former persecutions.

D'Alembert succeeds him.

The conspirators in losing Voltaire, had lost every thing on the side of talents; but his arms of impiety they had remaining in his numerous writings. The arts and cunning of D'Alembert proved more than a succedaneum to the genius of their deceased founder, and he is proclaimed chief. The secret committee of education in Paris, the country conventicles and the correspondence with the village school-masters owed their origin



origin to him. He continued to direct the works of the secret academy, in the propagation of impiety, until called upon to appear before that same God who had already judged Voltaire. He died <sup>He dies.</sup> five years after his patron, that is in November 1783. Left remorse should compel him to similar recantations, which had so much humbled the sect, Condorcet undertook to render him inaccessible; if not to repentance and remorse, at least to all who might have availed themselves of his homage done to religion.

When the Rector of St. Germain's, in quality of pastor presented himself, Condorcet, like to the devil who watches over his prey, ran to the door and barred his entrance! Scarce had the breath left his body when the pride of Condorcet betrays his secret. D'Alembert really had felt that remorse which must have been common to him with Voltaire; he was on the eve of sending, as the only method of reconciliation, for a minister of that same Christ against whom he had also conspired; but Condorcet ferociously combated these last signs of repentance in the dying Sophister, and he gloried in having forced him to expire in final impenitence. The whole of this odious conflict is comprized in one horrid sentence; when Condorcet announced the decease of DAlembert and was relating the circumstances, he did not

not blush to add, *Had I not been there he would have flinched also* \*.

**Frederick** Frederick alone had succeeded or pretended to have succeeded in persuading himself that death was but an eternal sleep †. And he alone appears to have been an exception from among the chiefs of the conspiracy, with whom the approach of death had substituted, in lieu of their pretended hatred for the *wretch*, the fear of his judgments.

Diderot that hero of Atheism, that conspirator who long since had carried his audacity against his Christ and his God, to insanity; Diderot I say, is he who was nearest to a true reconciliation. This is another of those mysteries of iniquity carefully hidden by the Antichristian conspirators.

\* Historical Dictionary, Article D'Alembert. It is true that Condorcet, sorry to have inadvertently revealed the secret of his associate's remorse, sought to destroy the effect of it. It is true, that questioned another time on the circumstances of D'Alembert's death, he answered in his philosophic jargon, *that he did not die like a coward*. In fine it is true that in his first letter to the King of Prussia, in date of the 22d Nov. 1783, he represents D'Alembert dying with a tranquil courage, and with his usual strength and presence of mind. But it was too late to lead Frederick into error on that subject, as the adept Grimm had already written, *That sickness had greatly weakened D'Alembert's mind in his last moments* (11th of November 1783.)

† Vide *supra*.

When

When the Empress of Russia purchased Diderot's library, she left him the use of it during his life. Her munificence had enabled him to have near his person, in quality of librarian, a young man who was far from partaking in his impiety. Diderot liked him much, and he had particularly endeared himself by the attentions he had shown Diderot during his last illness. It was he who generally dressed the wounds in his legs. Terrified at the symptoms he perceived, the young man runs to acquaint a worthy ecclesiastic, the Abbé Lemoine, then resident at the house called the Foreign Missions, Rue du Bac Fauxbourg, St. Germain. By his advice the young man prays during half an hour in a church, begging of Almighty God, that he will direct him in what he should say or do, to ensure the salvation of one, who though he detested his impieties, he could never lose sight of as his benefactor. Rising from his prayers he returns to Diderot and the same day when dressing his wounds, he spoke as follows:

“ Mr. Diderot, you see me this day more anxious than ever on your fate, do not be surprised, I am aware how much I am indebted to you, it is by your kindness that I subsist, you have deigned to show greater confidence in me than I had reason to expect. I cannot prove ungrateful, I should for ever accuse myself of ingratitude,

" gratitude, were I to hide the danger, which  
 " your wounds declare you to be in. Mr. Dide-  
 " rot, you may have dispositions to make, and  
 " above all you have precautions to take, for the  
 " world you are about to enter. I am but a young  
 " man I know; but are you certain that your  
 " philosophy has not left you a soul to save? I  
 " have no doubt of it, and it is impossible for  
 " me to reflect on it, and not warn my benefactor  
 " to avoid the eternal misfortune which may await  
 " him. See, sir, you have yet sufficient time  
 " left, and excuse an advice which gratitude and  
 " your friendship forces from me."

Diderot heard the young man with attention, and  
 even melted into tears, thanked him for his frank-  
 ness and the concern he had shown for him. He  
 promised to consider and to reflect what line of  
 conduct he should hold in a situation which he  
 owned to be of the greatest importance.

The young man waited his decision with the  
 greatest impatience, and the first signs were con-  
 formable to his wishes. He ran to inform the  
 Abbé Lemoine that Diderot asked to see a clergy-  
 man, and the Abbé directed him to Mr. de Tersac,  
 Rector of St. Sulpice. Mr. de Tersac waited  
 on Diderot and had several conferences with him,  
 he was preparing a public recantation of his past  
 errors, but unfortunately he was watched by the  
 conspirators. The visit of a priest to Diderot  
 had

had given the alarm to the Sophisters, who would have thought themselves dishonored by the dereliction of so important a chief. They surround him, they persuade him that he is imposed upon, that his health is not in so bad a state; and that a little country air would immediately recover him. Diderot was for a long time deaf to all the arguments Philosophism could invent, but at length consented to try at least the country air. His departure is kept secret and the wretches who carry him away, knew that his last hour was approaching fast. The Sophisters who were in the plot pretended to think him still in Paris, and the whole town is misled by daily reports; while those jailors who had seized on his person, watched him till they had seen him expire; then continuing their horrid duplicity they bring back the lifeless corpse to Paris and spread the report that he had died suddenly at table. He expired the 2d of July 1784, and was represented as having died calm, in all his Atheism, without giving any signs of remorse. The public are again misled and thus many are corroborated in their impiety, who might have followed the example of this chief, had he not by the most unheard-of cruelty, been deprived of all spiritual relief in his last moments.

Thus in the whole of this conspiracy, from its origin to the death of its first promoters, we have seen but one continued chain of cunning, art

VOL. I.

A 2

and

and seduction; of the blackest, falsest and most disgusting means employed in that tremendous art of seducing the people. It was on these horrid arts that Voltaire, D'Alembert and Diderot had built all their hopes of working the universal apostacy, and in their last moments they are a prey to these very arts. In that awful moment when glory vanishes and that the empty name they had acquired by their deceit is no more, the disciple of seduction lords it over his master. When their reason calls on them to make use of that liberty, (so much cried up when opposed to their God) to reconcile themselves with him they had blasphemed, even to their very remorse, is sacrificed to the vanity of their school: when it calls on them to use that courage they had shown when blaspheming, it fails them in their repentance, and they show none but the slavish symptoms of weakness and fear. Under the subjection of their adepts, they expire fettered in those chains which they themselves had forged, and consumed by that impiety, which their hearts then abhorred.

At the time of their death, hatred to Christianity and the conspiracy against the altar, was not the only object of their school. Voltaire had been the father of the Sophisters of impiety, and he lived to be the premier chief of the Sophisters of rebellion. He had said to his first adepts, " Let us crush the altar, " let the temples be destroyed and let not a single  
 " worshipper

“ worshipper be left to the God of the Christians ;” and his school soon re-echoed with the cry of, “ Let us break the sceptres, let the thrones be destroyed, and let not a single subject be left to the kings of the earth.” It is from their mutual success, the combined revolution is to be generated, which grasping the hatchet, shall in France overthrow the altar and the throne, murder the pontiffs, strike off the head of the monarch, and proudly menace the kings of the earth and all Christian altars, with a similar fate.—We have now given the history of the plots and of the means of the ANTICHRISTIAN CONSPIRACY, or of the *Sophisters of Impiety*. Before we begin that of the ANTI-MONARCHIAL CONSPIRACY, or of the *Sophisters of Rebellion*, let us reflect on the extraordinary illusion Philosophism has put upon all nations, which may be considered as having been one of the most powerful agents of the sect.

---

## CHAP. XIX.

*Of the great Delusion which rendered the Conspiracy against the Altar so successful.*

IN the first part of these Memoirs on Jacobinism, our object was to demonstrate the existence, to unmask the chiefs and deduce the means and progress of a conspiracy, planned and executed by men, known by the name of Philosophers, against the Christian religion, without distinction of Protestantism or Catholicity, without even excepting those numerous sects which had sprung up in England or Germany, or in any other part of the universal world, provided they did but adore the God of Christians. To unfold this mystery of impiety, we had promised to adduce our proofs solely from their own records, that is from their letters, writings or avowals, and we flatter ourselves with having given real historical demonstration of it, sufficient to convince the reader, the most difficult of conviction. Let us for a moment examine what pretensions its authors could have had to be styled PHILOSOPHERS, a name which gave them so much weight in their conspiracy.

The



The generality of men attending rather to words than things, this affectation of dominion over wisdom and reason, proved a very successful weapon in their hands. Had they called themselves unbelievers or the declared enemies of Christianity, Voltaire and D'Alembert would have been the execration of all Europe, while only calling themselves PHILOSOPHERS, they are mistaken for such. Is not their school to this day, venerated by many as that of Philosophy, notwithstanding the numerous massacres, and all the horrid disasters which we have seen naturally flowing from their conspiracy. And every man who will adopt their way of thinking on religion, styles himself a Philosopher!—

This is a delusion of more consequence than can be imagined, and has carried the number of adepts perhaps farther than any other of their artifices. Delusion on the word Philosophy.

As long as their school shall be mistaken for that of reason, numberless will be the thoughtless persons who, pretending to depth of thought, will adopt the sentiments of a Voltaire or a Diderot, of a D'Alembert or a Condorcet, and conspire like them against the altar; and that disastrous blast will once more spread around the throne, and over all the orders of society.—Their oaths, their wishes and their plots have been laid open; whence then are their pretensions to wisdom? Is it not the historian's duty to tear off that mask of hypocrisy, which has misled such numbers of

A a 3 adepts,

adepts, who miserably seeking to soar above the vulgar, have only sunk into impiety, gazing after this pretended Philosophy. The empty sounds of *Reason*, *Philosophy* and *Wisdom*, have made them believe themselves inspired, when like Voltaire, they hated or despised the religion of Christ. But it is time they should know that they have only been the dupes of designing men. Let them hearken, the numerous proofs we have adduced, give us a right to be heard when we tell them, “ that at the school of the conspirators they have “ mistaken the lessons of hatred and phrenzy, for “ those of reason ; they have been the dupes of “ folly and madness, under the cloak of reason ; “ of ignorance, under the pretence of science ; of “ vice and depravity, under the mask of virtue, “ and their zeal for Philosophy, still makes them “ err through all the tortuous windings of wicked- “ nefs and impiety.” We do not pretend, in holding such language, to dispute the talents of the premier chief. That his poetic genius should enjoy itself in fictions, on the banks of Parnassus, or on the heights of Pindus, is much to be admired ; but is he for that, to substitute those fictions for truths ? The greater his genius, the less we are astonished to see him entangled, when he has once adopted error. If stupidity can never attain to genius, the genius that dares to soar above reason, is not for that the less within the regions of delirium.

delirium. In a raging fever, will not your strength be redoubled, but what more humbling sight for man! Where then the excuse of genius or of talents in the Sophister conspiring against his God? Can the adepts, who believe their master to be a Philosopher even to his last moments, admire that frantic rage in which he expired? But first let them tell us what other titles he may have to the empire of reason.

What Philosophy can there be in that extraordinary *barred* which Voltaire had sworn against the God of Christianity? That a Nero should have sworn to crush the Christians and their God, may be explained, because the idea could only have been that of a cruel monster. That a Dioclesian should have sworn it, may be understood, because the idolatrous tyrant thought to appease the anger of his gods and avenge their glory. That a Julian, mad enough to restore the worship of idols, should have sworn it, appears only to have been a consequence of his former delirium. But that a pretended sage, who neither believes in the God of the Christians, nor in the Gods of the Pagans, and that knows not in what God to believe, should vent all his rage and fury precisely against Christ, is one of those phenomenons of modern Philosophism, which can be explained but as the delirium of the impious man.

A a 4

I do

I do not pretend by this to exclude from the school of reason every one who is not fortunate enough to be within the pale of Christianity; let that man rank with an Epictetus or a Seneca, or before the Christian æra, with a Socrates or a Plato, who has been unfortunate enough not to have known the proofs of Christianity. But this real Philosophy of reason sought, what Voltaire has conspired to destroy. The greatest of Socrates's disciples pants for the coming of that just man who shall dissipate the darkness and the doubts of the sage; I hear him exclaim, "Let him come that man, let him come who will teach us our duties towards the Gods, and our duty towards man. Let him come incessantly; I am ready to obey whatever he may ordain, and I hope he will make me a better man\*." Such is the language of the Philosophy of reason. I think I behold him again, when in the bitterness of his heart he foresees, that should this just man appear upon earth, he would be scoffed at by the wicked, buffeted and scourged, treated in a word as the outcast of men†. That man has appeared so much sought for by the Pagan Philosopher, and the conspiring Sophisters, a D'Alembert or a Voltaire, seek to crush him and yet pretend to the Philo-

\* Plato in his second Alcibiades,

† Ibid.

sophy

sophy of reason. Let their disciples answer for them. If in the son of Mary they will not acknowledge the Son of the Eternal Father, let them own him at least to be that just man fought for by Plato—what then are their pretensions to the Philosophy of reason in conspiring against him? If the awful testimony of the sun being darkened, the dead rising from their graves, the veil of the temple being rent, cannot convince them; let them at least admire the most holy, the justest of men, the prodigy of goodness and meekness, the apostle of every virtue, the wonder of oppressed innocence praying for his executioners—where then is their Philosophy when they conspire against the Son of Man? Yes, Philosophy they had, but it was that of the Jews, that of the synagogue, whence issued those blasphemous cries of, “Crucify him, crucify him!” or *crush the wretch!* Judas himself confesses him to be the just man, and shall he approach to perfection when compared to their school of modern Philosophy. Oh, what a Philosophy! that after seventeen centuries repeats the blasphemous cries which resounded in the courts of Pilate or Herod, against the Holy of Holies!—In vain shall the disciple deny the hatred of Voltaire against the *person* of CHRIST; does he not particularly distinguish Darnilaville for that hatred, does he not sign himself *Christ-moque* (Christ-scoffer), just as he terminates his letters by  
*crush*

*crush the wretch*, or talks of the *Christicole* superstition\*? Yet whilst the Sophister denies the power of Christ, he cannot refuse acknowledging his wisdom, his goodness, and his virtue.

But they may object, that it is not so much at the person as at the *religion* of Christ they aim their blows. Where then is the Philosophy in attacking a religion whose essence is to enforce every virtue, and condemn every vice. Either before or after Christ, has there ever appeared a Philosopher, who has even formed the idea of a virtue of which this religion does not give the precept or set the example? Is there a crime or a vice which it does not condemn and reprobate? Has the world ever seen a sage, impressing such divine doctrines with more powerful motives? Either before or since Christ, did there ever exist laws more conducive to the interior happiness of families, or to that of empires? Laws that teach men the reciprocal ties of affection; laws in short that more peremptorily command us to afford each other mutual assistance? Let the Philosopher appear who pretends to perfect this religion; let him be heard and judged. But should he, like Voltaire and his adepts, only seek to destroy it, let him be comprised in the common sentence of madman, and of enemy to humanity.

\* Letter to the Marq. D'Argence, 2d March 1763.

It is only at the altars, at the *mysteries* of that religion, and not at the *morality* of it, they aim their blows.—In the first place that is not true, as we have already seen and shall see again. Their attack was common on the morality of the Gospel, as well as on the mysteries or the altars of Christianity.—But had it been true, what is there to be found in these mysteries, sufficient to render the Christian religion so hateful in the eyes of the Philosopher? Do any of them favor the crimes and faults of men? Do any of them counteract his affection for his neighbour, or render him less attentive to his own duties, less faithful to friendship or gratitude, or less attached to his country? Is there a single mystery which does not elevate the Christian, stimulate his admiration for his God, or spur him on to his own happiness, and to the love of his neighbours? The son of God expiring on a cross, to open the gates of heaven to man, to teach him what he has to dread, should he by his crimes, be unfortunate enough to close them again. The bread of angels, given only to those who have purified themselves from the dross of sin: those words pronounced on the man repenting of his crimes, and firmly purposing rather to die than to fall into them anew. The awful sight of a God who comes to judge the living and the dead; to call to him those who have loved, clothed and fed their brethren, while he casts

casts into eternal flames the ambitious man, the traitor and the tyrant; the hard-hearted rich, the bad servant, and the violator of the nuptial tie. Lastly, all persons who have not loved and helped their neighbour. Are all these, I say, mysteries at which the philosopher should direct his hatred, or can reason, on such a plea, authorise his conspiracy against the religion of the Christians.

Should Voltaire and his disciples refuse to believe these *mysteries*, does it import to them that other people should not equally disbelieve them. Is the Christian more dangerous to them because he that forbids me to injure my brother, is the same God before whom we are both one day to appear in judgment. Is that God less tremendous to the wicked, or less favorable to the just, because on his word we believe him to be one in essence, though three in persons? This hatred of Voltaire must be a phrenzy which the very infidels themselves, could not ground on such pretexts. What frantic rage must it be that blinds the Sophisters, when in contradiction with themselves, they applaud the toleration of the ancient Philosophers, who, though disbelieving the mysteries of Paganism, never attempted to rob the people of their religion; whilst on the other side they incessantly conspire against Christianity under pretence that it contains mysteries.

Another



Another objection not less extravagant, is that against *Revelation* itself. It is God, they say, whom the Christians declare to have spoken; hence there can be no further liberty of opinion in man on matters of faith. The Sophister of liberty and equality is then authorised to rise in arms against Christianity and its mysteries. Such are their arguments. But to what lengths does their phrensy carry them? Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Diderot, conspire to overthrow every altar, Roman or Lutheran, Calvinist or Anglican, and that in order to avenge the rights of liberty and toleration in matters of faith. What bedlamite idea is this? Can reason be traced through plots and conspiracies, of which the sole tendency is the overthrow of the universal religion of Europe, under pretence of liberty of worship: we have heard Voltaire invoking Belerophons and Herculeffes to his aid, to crush the God of the Christians; D'Alembert, expressing the frantic wish of seeing a whole nation annihilated for its attachment to that God and his worship; have we not seen them for half a century past, meanly conspiring and using all the artifice of cunning intrigue to rob the world of its religion? And because they utter the empty sounds of LIBERTY, EQUALITY, and TOLERATION, you will mistake their voice for that of Philosophy!—Far from us the idea of such Philosophy; terms themselves must have been changed, for this must

must be extravagance and absurdity ; and is not such REASON madness and phrenzy ? Such must be the explanation of these words to expound the REASON and PHILOSOPHY of a Voltaire or a D'Alembert, conspiring to crush the religion of Christ.

I could wish not to have to mention Frederick again. I reflect that he was a king ; but alas ! he is also the royal Sophister. Let us then examine how far philosophy misled him, and whether his wisdom extended beyond the genius of the meanest adept.

Frederick wrote, but why ? It is a problem. Was it to impose on the public, or to delude himself ? decide it who can. Probably for both, which he seems to have succeeded in. Frederick would sometimes write in favor of Toleration, and he was believed to be tolerant. In the *Monthly Review*, October 1794, page 154, we see him cried up as a model of toleration, and the following passage of his works is quoted : “ I never will constrain opinions on matters of religion. I dread religious wars above all others. I have been so fortunate that none of the sects who reside in my states, have ever disturbed civil order. We must leave to the people the objects of their belief, the form of their devotion, their opinions, and *even their prejudices*. It is for this reason I have tolerated priests and monks, IN

SPITE

“ SPITE of *Voltaire and D'Alembert, who have*  
 “ QUARRELLED WITH ME ON THIS HEAD. I have  
 “ the greatest veneration for all our modern Phi-  
 “ losophers, but indeed I am compelled to ac-  
 “ knowledge that a GENERAL TOLERATION is not  
 “ the *predominant virtue in these gentlemen.*” From  
 this the editors draw many excellent conclusions  
 by objecting the wisdom of Frederick's doctrine  
 to the atrocious persecutions and ferocious intol-  
 leration of the French Sophisters; but the reader  
 who has seen him stimulate these same Philoso-  
 phers to overthrow the altar, *to crush the wretch:*  
 who has seen him trace the plan so much admired  
 by Voltaire as that of *a Great Captain* for the  
 destruction of the priests and monks, in order  
 to attack the bishops and to compass the over-  
 throw of religion\*: who has heard him decide  
 that the Antichristian Revolution, which he so  
*much longed to see*, could only be accomplished  
*by a superior force* and that *the sentence* which was  
 definitively *to crush* religion was *to issue from govern-*  
*ment*†; will the reader I say, recognize the tole-  
 ration of the sophistical monarch! No, he will  
 pass the same judgment on the Sophister which  
 the editors have passed on the disciples of that  
 school. “ WHEN SUCH MEN tell us their *object*  
 “ *is to carry into practice all the perfection of Theory,*

\* Vide supra, Chap. VI.

† 24th March 1767, 13th August 1775.

“ we

“ we know not which we ought principally to  
 “ feel *our* DISGUST or INDIGNATION.” But let  
 us revere the monarch, let us vent our indigna-  
 tion against that frantic Philosophism which involves  
 in darkness the royal adept on his throne, as it did  
 his masters in their sanhedrims and secret aca-  
 demies, eradicating from man every symptom of  
 reason.

If any thing could paint the folly of the masters  
 in stronger colors, it would be that empty pride  
 of the adepts at the period when they look upon  
 the grand object of their conspiracy to be accom-  
 plished. Religion was mourning over her altars  
 overthrown, her temples profaned; when Con-  
 dorcet exalting the triumph of Voltaire, exclaims:  
 “ Here at length it is permitted openly to pro-  
 “ claim the right, so long refused, of reducing  
 “ all opinions to the standard of *our own reason*;  
 “ that is to say, to employ, in order to attain to  
 “ truth, the *only implement* that has been given  
 “ us to recognize it. Man learns with a certain  
 “ pride, that he is not designed by nature to  
 “ believe on the affirmation of others; and the  
 “ superstitions of antiquity, the degradation of  
 “ reason in the phrensy of a supernatural faith,  
 “ are vanished from society as they were from  
 “ Philosophy \*.”

\* Sketch on the Progress of Mind, epoch 9.

Condor-

Condorcet when writing these words no doubt meant to describe the triumph of reason, over revelation and over the whole Christian religion. The adepts applaud, and like him, believe in the pretended triumph of reason. But it had not less cause than religion to mourn over such triumphs. Was it then, to reinstate man in the right of bringing his *opinions* to the test of *reason*, that the Sophisters had with unrelenting fury conspired against the religion of Christ? What could they have intended by this test? Was it to exercise the right of only believing what their reason when convinced, invited them to believe? If so, where the necessity of conspiring? Does the religion of Christ command man to believe what his enlightened reason does not induce him to believe? Is it not to convince our reason that Christianity surrounded itself with incontestable proofs, that Christ and his Apostles wrought numberless miracles, that religion has preserved its records, and that her pastors invite the Christian to the spirit of research, that he may know what has been proved and what he ought to believe; that her apostles formally declare, that *his faith, his submission should be reasonable* (*rationabile obsequium vestrum*); and can the Sophister hence infer that conspiracies and the darkest plots are necessary to vindicate the rights of reason believing in religion? A religion whose God is the God of reason;

VOL. I.

B b

whose

whose tenets are the tenets of reason; whose rights are the rights of reason rejecting sophistry and false prejudices, but whose duty is to believe from the numerous proofs of the power, of the sanctity, of the wisdom and sublimity of the God who speaks, and on the authenticity of his word.

If by the rights of reason the Sophister means the right of only believing what his reason can conceive, and that ceases to be mysterious; then these rights of reason must truly border on phrensy. The Sophister is no longer to believe in the light of the day nor the darkness of the night, till light and its action on man shall cease to be a mystery; no longer shall he believe in the oak towering over the forest, raised from an acorn; nor in the humble flower glowing in the brightest colors; no longer shall he believe in man, succeeding from generation to generation; nature shall be denied, and his own existence remain a doubt until all is clearly conceived by his reason, and that the veil of mystery spread over these various objects shall be rent asunder.—Thus to attain the honors of incredulity, he submits to the garb of folly.

How different is the language of the real sage! His reason declares that objects once proved are to be believed, however mysterious they may be, under the penalty of absurdity; for then they are believed to exist because their existence is demon-

demonstrated, and not as the Sophister would pretend, because their nature is inconceivable.

But another right equally inconceivable and triumphantly inculcated by Condorcet is that of being reduced *in order to attain to truth, to the only implement that has been given us to distinguish it!* If then nature has left me in the dark, on objects of the greatest importance, on my future state; on the means of avoiding a destiny I dread, or of obtaining the lot I desire; the man who shall dissipate the mist with which I am surrounded, will have robbed me of my rights? Why did he not say that the right of the blind man is also to keep to the only instrument nature had given him, and that it would be encroaching on his rights if he that has eyes, should attempt to lead him? Why did he not conclude that the blind man had also learned with a *sort of pride* that nature had never designed that he should believe in light on the assertion of another.—What philosophic pride is that of the Sophister! His reason is degraded by a *supernatural faith!*—Christianity, he thinks, has debased his reason by raising it above the sphere of this world; he thinks the God of Christians has vilified man by explaining to him his eternal destiny, and leaving him the memory of his miracles as a proof of his word.—Such a pretension was the grand plea for the Antichristian Conspiracy, and dared they invoke

B b 2

the

the name of reason? Were they believed to be Philosophers? And do many as yet labor under this error?—But let us return to their masters, to Voltaire, D'Alembert and Diderot, let us show to the adepts, the unfortunate dupes of ignorance also decorated with the title of Philosophers. —To accomplish this, it will only be necessary, to point out the most formal avowals and mutual confidences of these pretended Philosophers.

Dupes  
of igno-  
rance.

Does God exist, or does he not?—Have I a soul to save, or have I not?—Is this life to be entirely spent for my present interest?—Am I to believe in a future state?—Is this God, this soul and this future state what I am told, or am I to believe quite another thing?—Such certainly are the elementary questions of true science, of Philosophy the most apposite to the happiness of man both in itself and in its consequences. On questions of such importance, what do these assuming sages reply, what are their mutual answers to each other, at the very time they are conspiring against Christ? Has not the reader seen their letters, their own expressions; did not these men, who pretended to the empire of knowledge, formally and repeatedly declare that they were unable even to form an opinion on any of these questions. Voltaire consulted by the citizen or by the prince, consults D'Alembert in his turn, whether there is a God; whether he has a soul; and a *non liquet* (I do not know),



know), is the answer he receives—These must be strange Philosophers indeed, uncertain on the very principles of Philosophy; whence can they assume the title of rulers of reason, they who are ignorant of that science on which the morals, principles and basis of society rest; on which the duties of man, of the father of a family and of the citizen, of the prince and of the subject, on which in short, their conduct and happiness entirely depend? What can be their science on man if they are perfectly ignorant of his nature? What can be their doctrine on his duties; on his grand concerns; if they are ignorant of his future destiny? What is that Philosophy which barely teaches me that I am ever to be in the dark with regard to those objects, which most concern me and those I am to live with?

We have seen D'Alembert, in order to hide his ignorance, absurdly excusing it by answering, that it could be of little concern to man, not to be able to solve these questions on the soul, on God, or on a future state\*. We have seen Voltaire declaring that nothing was known of these first principles, yet own that uncertainty was a disagreeable state; but pleading this uncertainty itself, he adds, that certainty is a ridiculous state or that of a quack†. Thus because the former

\* Letter to Voltaire 25th of July and 4th of August 1770.

† Letter to the Prince Royal of Prussia, 28th Nov. 1770.

is ignorant on these questions, it can little import man to know whether his concerns extend no further than this mortal life, or whether a happy or an unhappy eternity is to be his fate. Because the latter is equally ignorant, though more unhappy in his ignorance, man is to despise whoever shall pretend to dispel his doubts; Christ and his Apostles are to be treated with ridicule, and certainty shall be the doctrine of a Quack! — This cannot be ignorance alone, it must be pride and folly; what! Man is to be buried in darkness, because the jealous eye of the Sophister is dazzled with the light.

Dupes of  
depravity  
mistaken  
for vir-  
tue.

Hatred, jealousy and destruction contain the whole science of these pretended sages. Hate the Gospel, calumniate its author, overthrow his altars, and your science will be that of the modern Philosopher. Profess yourself a Deist, an Atheist, a Sceptic, a Spinosist, in short, whatever you please; deny or affirm, set up a doctrine or a worship in opposition to the religion of Christ, or set up none, that is not what either the sect or Voltaire himself requires to constitute a modern Philosopher. When asked what doctrine he wished to substitute to that of Christ, did he not think himself authorised to answer, I have delivered them from the physicians (he called the clergy physicians), what farther service do they require? Require! have you not infected them with the plague?

plague? Have you not unbridled every passion? And what remedies have you left them? In vain were it for us to challenge Voltaire and his panegyrist Condorcet, they will not answer.—No, follow their example; declare all religious truths to be erroneous, false, or popular prejudices, to be superstition and fanaticism; glory in destruction, little troubling yourself with substituting science for ignorance, or truth for error; to have destroyed will suffice, and for that you shall be entitled to the high-sounding name of a modern Philosopher.

At this rate, the reader's surprise must cease, at the numerous tribe of Philosophers to be found in every rank, of all ages and sexes. But at such a rate can an honest man pride himself in the title of Philosopher. Such a science is, alas! but too easily acquired. It is as yet a problem why Voltaire, on his outset, seemed to confine his views to the higher classes, to kings, nobles and the rich, why he should have excluded *beggars and the rabble*.

On seeing the guests smile at the blasphemies uttered at table, will not the footman soon equal his master in the Philosophic science, will he not also learn to scoff at the pontiff and the pastor, at the altar and the gospel! Will not the butchering Marseillois, like Condorcet, glory in having cast off those vulgar prejudices, when in those bloody murders of September, he overthrows the altar and stains its steps with the blood of its priests and pontiffs. Like

B b 4

Voltaire,

Voltaire, will he not style this, the Age of Reason, and of enlightened Philosophy? Harangue the vilest of the populace; tell them that the priests are imposing on them, that hell is of their invention, that the time is come to throw off the yoke of fanaticism and superstition, to assert the liberty of their reason; and in a few minutes, the ignorant plough-boy will rival, in Philosophic science, the most learned of the adepts. The language may vary, but the science will be the same. They will hate with the adept, and will destroy what he wished to crush. The more ignorant and ferocious they are, the more easily shall they adopt your hatred, which constitutes the whole of this sophisticated science.

If adepts are sought for in another line, it is easy to increase their numbers, but without adding to the science of the sect. Thus let the daughter of Necker but find some impertinent sarcasm of hers against the Gospel, taken for wit by D'Alembert, and she immediately becomes as Philosophic as he, and as void of religious prejudices as sister Guillemetta. It had astonished many to see the numbers of young fops, who were already styled philosophers, when they scarce had had time to read any thing, except a few impious pamphlets. But this age of enlightened Philosophy, can no longer be a subject of surprise.

What!

What ! shall every wanton coquette partake of this Philosophy, shall every husband or wife, who scoffs at conjugal fidelity, shall every son who, throwing aside all sentiments of duty, and denying the authority of a parent, shall they all be styled Philosophers ? The courtier destitute of morals, or the man who is a slave to, and imprudently gives loose to his passions, they also will glory in the name of Philosopher ! Voltaire, in spite of all their vices, rejects none of these from his school, provided they have the necessary requisites of scoffing at the mysteries, of insulting the priesthood, and hating the God of the gospel. Certainly these cannot be simply the dupes of ignorance, mistaken for science. No ; these must be the children of corruption substituted for the school of virtue. That folly, that frantic rage which consumes Voltaire, conspiring against his God, or setting heaven at defiance, when he writes to D'Alembert, *twenty years more and God will be in a pretty plight*, or when he repeatedly writes to Damilaville, *crush, crush the Wretch* ; that I say may be more worthy of pity than of blame. Yes, Voltaire in the phrensy of his rage is to be pitied. That multitude of adepts, of noblemen, ministers, and citizens, are to be excused, who without having the least idea of Philosophy, have believed themselves Philosophers, being misled by those impious Sophisters. I will not even ask them, since when could the bare title of  
Philosopher,

Philosopher, assumed by Frederick and Voltaire, suffice to constitute them masters in a science of which they openly professed their ignorance and contempt: I will not tell them, that if Frederick, consummate in the art of war, could form warriors; that if Voltaire, rivalling Corneille, could give lessons to the poet, nevertheless they were both equally ignorant in point of religion. I will not say to them, that this latter is a science like all others, requiring great application and study, in order to excel; that it was absurd to look for masters and teachers in men who blasphemed what they neither understood nor sought to understand; in men, who often stammering out a petty sophism, which they deemed unanswerable, resembled the child, who dashes the watch on the ground because the spring is hidden from him. Such would be the reflexions of common sense, which should have rendered the school of the Sophisters at least suspected, if not absurd and ridiculous to its adepts; when Frederick combats the Sorbonne, or Voltaire St. Thomas; when D'Alembert attacks St. Augustin, or Sister Guillemetta St. Paul.

It is possible, that all these great Sophisters, debating on divinity, religion and tenets, may have been mistaken by the ignorant adepts for learned doctors. But when the whole school, treating of morality and virtue, pretend to direct them solely by the rules of natural religion, the very shadow  
of

of a pretext for their delusion, disappears. From casting an eye on the sect, could they perceive a single adept who, under the direction of Voltaire or D'Alembert, had quitted his religion to become a better father or a better son, a better husband or a better man, in short more virtuous ! Would not the simple reflexion have sufficed, that this pretended Philosophy of virtue had regularly been the refuge of all those men who were publicly known to scoff at every duty, at all morality : that when the friends to religion reproached them with the dissoluteness of their morals, they as constantly answered with a sort of sneer, such reproaches may do for men, who have not as yet shaken off the prejudices of the Gospel—but we are Philosophers, and we know what to believe !!

It would be impossible to hide, that every vice was cloaked under such a Philosophy ; the faithless wife, the profligate youth, the man practising every art, whether just or unjust, to attain his ends, even to the loose women whose characters were openly disparaged, all decorated themselves with the high-sounding name of Modern Philosophers. None would have dared to justify their criminal conduct by answering,—I am a Christian,—I believe in the Gospel.—Let not the chiefs charge the error and ignorance on the disciples. The adept knew but too well that nothing but the name of virtue remained

mained in the school of the Sophisters; that the greater progress he made in their science, the more he adopted their principles, by setting at defiance the reproach of the virtuous man, and by smothering the cries of his own conscience. It is true they had not barefacedly blasphemed the morality of the Gospel, but they had erased from their code all those virtues *which religion maintains to be descended from heaven*. He had seen the long list of those which they called *sterile and imaginary virtues*, or *virtues of prejudice*; he had seen erased from their code, all that list of real virtues such as modesty and continence, conjugal fidelity and filial piety, gratitude and forgiveness of injuries, disinterestedness, even probity itself\*. To these virtues they had substituted ambition, pride, vain glory, the pleasures and the passions. Their morality acknowledged no other virtue than that *which is advantageous*; nor vice but that *which is hurtful* in this world; and virtue is declared to be but *an empty dream* if the virtuous man is unhappy†. Personal interest is laid down as the sole principle of all Philosophic virtues; they sometimes indeed name *beneficence* as one, but that is merely as an excuse to dispense them from the practice of every other virtue. *Friend, do good to*

\* See the original texts quoted in the Helvian Letters, vol. 5.

† Vide *supra*, note to 9th chapter.



us and we will overlook every thing else, is the express doctrine of Voltaire \*: but that was not all. It was necessary to bring the adepts to doubt even of the existence of virtue, to doubt whether in morality there existed a right and wrong, and it was to such a question that Voltaire did not blush to answer, *non liquet* (it is not known) †. As a further step they were to decide, that all that is called “perfection, imperfection, righteousness, wickedness, goodness, falsehood, wisdom, folly, only differed from each other by their sensations of pleasure or pain ‡.” “That the more the Philosopher examined the nature of things, the less he dared to assert that it depended any more on man to be pusillanimous, choleric, vicious or voluptuous, than it did to be squint-eyed, hump-backed or lame §.” Such were the lessons of the conspiring Sophisters, and can it be believed that such lessons could be mistaken for those of virtue and Philosophy?

Had the adept been certain as to the existence of vice and virtue, of what consequence would this distinction have been to him, when his masters teach him, that man is born for happiness, and that the latter consists *in pleasure, or the absence of*

\* Fragments on divers subjects, Art. VIRTUE.

† Philosophical Dictionary, Art. TOUT EST BIEN.

‡ Let of Thrasybulus.

§ Encyclopedia, Geneva edition, Art, VICE.

*pain.*

*pain* \*. When laying aside all solicitude for his soul, he is taught that *the motto of the wise man ought to be to watch over his body* †; or that it is by *pleasure* that God *stimulates to virtue* ‡. Such are the lessons taught by Voltaire, Diderot and D'Alembert, the chiefs of the conspirators.

What motives to virtue did these chiefs suggest to their adepts when they declared that a God neither *regards their virtues nor their vices*, that *the fear of this God is an absolute folly*! Or when wishing to stifle all remorse of conscience, they tell them that, “the man void of fear is above the laws—That a bad action, when useful, can be committed without remorse—That remorse is no other than the fear of men and of their laws.” When carrying their doctrine beyond all absurdity, they on one side assert the liberty of opinions in order to leave man free to choose the false, while, on the other side they destroy in him all liberty of action to smother all symptoms of remorse ||.

Such was the doctrine of the Sophisters. In vain would they attempt to deny it; all their writings are full of it, and particularly those which they most extolled as their principal master-pieces.

\* Encyclopedia, Art. HAPPINESS, and Preface.

† D'Alembert on the Elements of Philosophy, No. 5.

‡ Voltaire's Discourse on Happiness.

|| See their texts quoted in the Helvian Letters, vol. 3.

What

What could have been the conduct of these great philosophers, had they undertaken to draw up a code of villainy and depravity? What more could be required to demonstrate to the world that this pretended age of philosophy was no other than that of vice; than that of wickedness organized into principles and precepts for the use of the abandoned, to whom they might be advantageous.

The only plea that can be left to the numbers of adepts who styled themselves Philosophers, in alleviation of their criminality, is the amazing constancy and artfulness which it required from the chiefs, to propagate their principles, and ensure the success of their conspiracy. Dupes of wickedness.

But with these artifices, these intrigues, what was their philosophy? Let us suppose that during the life-time of Voltaire, of Frederick, or of D'Alembert, and before depravity had attained to such a height, let us suppose that the frequent and repeated orders given to the conspirators, of *strike, but bide your band*, had been known; let us suppose that the people had been acquainted with all the tortuous means secretly used to seduce them, would any one then have traced the actions of the Philosopher, in such dark hypocrisy, in such perpetual dissimulation, or in the ambushes which were their only means of success.

At the time when D'Alembert and Condorcet, Diderot, Helvetius and Turgot, held their sittings  
at

at the Hotel D'Holbach, under the name of *Œconomists*, and under the pretence of meditating on the happiness of the people, had it been known by that same people, that they were only plotting against the altars of the God whom it adored; had it been known that those teachers, who had been appointed to instruct the rising generation, were only the impious emissaries of D'Alembert, sent to corrupt its morals; that all those hawkers of books sold at so low a rate, were the agents of the secret academy, employed to circulate its poisons from towns to villages, and thence to the poorest cottages; would such means, I ask, have entitled the sect to that respect and veneration which it has usurped? Their wicked plots, once detected, could such fages have sufficed to have given to the century they lived in the appellation of the Philosophic Age? No: without doubt, horror would have succeeded to this admiration, and had the laws remained silent, public indignation would have avenged Philosophy of the infamous plots carried on under the cloak of its name.

Let then this age of pretended Philosophy, cast off the delusion under which it has been led away, a delusion arising perhaps more from its own vices and corruption, than from the arts of the conspirators; let it blush and repent. That unpolished multitude, confessing its inexperience in the ways  
of

of the Sophisters, whom instinctive virtue so long preserved from the arts of seduction, may be excusable; but let those thousands of adepts, who are to be found in the courts and palaces of the great, in the seats of literature, let them reflect on and scrutinize their past conduct. In adopting impiety they believed themselves Philosophers. In throwing off the yoke of the Gospel, and laying aside its virtues rather than its mysteries, they mistook the empty sounds of *prejudice* and *superstition*, perpetually repeated by the Sophisters, for profound reasoning. They were ignorant that the word prejudice only signifies an opinion void of proofs; and that they themselves had become slaves to prejudice, by casting off a religion of which they gloried in not having studied the proofs, while yet they read all the calumnies that its enemies could compile against it. Let them seek still further claims to this Philosophy in their own hearts: was it not to that lukewarm weariness for the virtues of the Gospel they were indebted for their admiration of the conspirators? Was it not the love of their passions which made them a prey to incredulity, far more than all the intrigues and ambushes of the Sophisters? It is much to be feared, that that man is already wicked, who makes himself so happy and glories so much in following the apostles of wickedness; or small indeed must have been his portion of Philosophy, if such

Vol. I.

C c

duplicity

duplicity, such meanness, and such conspiracies could have been mistaken for wisdom or virtue.

Whatever may have been the causes, it was ordained, that an age duped by the intrigues and conspiracies of impiety should glory in styling itself the *Age of Philosophy*. It was ordained that an age, a dupe to the frantic rage of impiety substituted to reason, a dupe to the oaths of hatred and the wish of crushing all religion, mistaken for toleration, for religious liberty and equality, to ignorance for science, to depravity for virtue, a dupe in short to all the intrigues and plots of the the most profound wickedness mistaken for the proceedings and means of wisdom ; it was ordained, I say, that this *Age of Philosophy* should also be a dupe to the plots of the rebellious Sophisters, mistaken for the love of society and the basis of public happiness.

The conspiracy against the altar, the hatred sworn by the chiefs against their God, were not the only legacies bequeathed by the chiefs to this school of modern philosophy. Voltaire was the father of the Sophisters of Impiety, and before his death he becomes the chief of the Sophisters of Rebellion. He had said to his first adepts, Let us crush the altar, and let not a single altar nor a single worshipper be left to the God of Christians ; and his school soon refounded with the cry of, *Let us crush the sceptre*, and let not a single throne

throne, nor a single subject be left to the kings of the earth! It was from the mutual success of these two schools, that the revolution was to be generated in France, which, grasping the hatchet, was at the same time to destroy the altar of the living God, and imbrue its steps with the blood of its pontiffs; to overturn the throne, and strike off the head of the unfortunate Lewis XVI.; menacing all the altars of Christendom, all the kings of the earth with a similar fate. To the plots contrived under the veil of liberty and equality, *applied to religion*, and of religious toleration, are to succeed those begotten under the veil of *political* liberty and equality. The mysteries of the second conspiracy, of the *Sophisters of Rebellion*, combining with those of *Impiety*, in order to generate the modern JACOBINS, will be the object of the Second Part of these Memoirs.

END OF THE FIRST PART,

# ERRATA.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>		
21,	5,	<i>for</i> decidedly,	<i>read</i> decidedly.
<i>ib.</i>	10,	as it,	as that it
29,	14,	those which	those whom.
<i>ib.</i>	16,	<i>dele</i> namely.	
40,	17,	torturous,	tortuous.
57,	12,	redaction,	compiling,
71,	14,	nor in,	or in.
75,	3,	was,	were.
78,	2,	but what,	with whom.
<i>ib.</i>	13,	by whom,	but that.
80,	ult.	he might,	he may.
88,	ult.	compulsed,	searched.
101,	19,	<i>dele</i> in,	
104,	28,	all what,	all that.
111,	19,	which intrigue,	whom intrigue.
113,	8,	stared him,	stared them.
117,	4,	they met,	but met.
120,	10,	Jane Chauvin,	Jean Chauvin.
137,	8,	part its	part of its.
<i>ib.</i>	13,	<i>dele</i> to.	
144,	6,	later,	hereafter.
155,	18,	but what that,	but the.
188,	17,	approximation,	comparison,
206,	2,	which may have,	to have.
222,	24, 26,	<i>dele</i> to.	
226,	5,	copies,	copying.
229,	4,	respectuously,	respectfully.
244,	4,	protected,	protected.
255,	6,	erred,	wandered.
285,	20,	do satisfaction,	atone.
334,	27,	which we,	whom we.
347,	24,	reviling,	revelling.
368,	12,	to be,	as,



# MEMOIRS,

ILLUSTRATING THE

## *HISTORY of JACOBINISM.*

A TRANSLATION FROM THE FRENCH OF

THE ABBE BARRUEL.

---

PART II.—VOL. II.

*THE ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY.*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY T. BURTON, NO. 11, GATE-STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS,

AND SOLD BY E. BOOKER, NO. 56, NEW BOND-STREET.

---

1797.

---

[Entered at Stationer's Hall.]

---

# P R E F A C E

OF THE

## TRANSLATOR.

---

THE Second Volume of the "*Memoirs of Jacobinism*," containing the ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY, is presented to the Public without the advantage which the First possessed in the flattering sanction of Mr. Burke's favorable opinion; an awful event having deprived the world of that illustrious writer. In the first of his Posthumous Works however, we find him attributing the progress of the French Revolution to a Spirit of Profelytism: he calls it "*A Revolution of Doctrine and Theoretic Dogma*, bearing little analogy with any of those Revolutions which had ever been brought about in Europe, on principles merely political\*." Our readers will be surprized at the coincidence of this Work with the ideas of that eloquent Champion of Real Liberty. The very education of the Adept in Rebellion is described; the dangerous tendency of maxims which

\* Thoughts on French Affairs, 1791, page 6.

have been received in their abstract sense is explained; the means employed to pervert them into principles of rebellion is demonstrated; divers essays of their new doctrines delineated; and, finally, the union of men thus educated with the most formidable Sect of Antiquity, in the *Occult Lodges* \* of Freemasonry is illustrated. With such a regular progression in the training of youth, with such detestable Chiefs to lead them, what evil is there that may not be feared. Is not the public weal in danger? Is it not become a problem in the present state of Europe — WHETHER A SINGLE GOVERNMENT SHALL SUBSIST? Is not every State equally threatened with danger?

Should any readers have viewed with indifference the formidable though evident Conspiracy against Christianity, and have contented themselves with saying, that it was the business of the Clergy to

\* We repeat, that by OCCULT LODGES are meant those LODGES which were hidden from the generality of Freemasons themselves. They are not the common Lodges frequented by men too honorable to be tampered with, and too much attached to their God and country to hearken to the rebellious and impious plots of the ARRIÈRES LOGES.

guard

guard against that ; let them remember, that the ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY approaches one step nearer to them--- It will rob them of their laws, and plunge them into the horrors of civil war.--- Such fears may perhaps awaken them, and spur them on to the study of principles fully detailed in this Volume (for it is a work of reflection and not of amusement); and if in treating of the *Occult Lodges* of Masonry they find horrors scarcely credible, let them reflect on the proofs adduced, and shudder at the precipice yawning beneath them. It is the duty of every subject to avert the impending danger. Let the parent instruct the child, whose happiness may be endangered both in this life and the next. Let the Clergyman enlighten his flock on the perils with which it is threatened ; for it is the duty he owes to his God and to his *Country*. Let the Magistrate watch over his district ; for the laws call on him for his aid, and it is he that would fall the first victim of the popular fury. Let the honorable Mason read and learn the abuses to which the Lodges are exposed,

posed, and he will guard them against the impious and rebellious principles of Occult Masonry. In fine, in appealing to the most incredulous, we shall lay before them the words of the learned and military Commentator of Polybius (*Chevalier de Follard*), who, speaking of the revolt of the foreign troops against the Carthaginians, after many shrewd observations on Conspiracies in general, turns his mind toward the times in which he was then writing, and as early as the year 1727, makes use of the following remarkable expressions: " A Conspiracy  
 " is forming at this present time, gradu-  
 " ally gaining ground, and by means so  
 " subtle, that I regret my not having  
 " come into the world *thirty* years later  
 " to see the end of it. It must be owned,  
 " that certain politicians are very wise,  
 " and that the glasses of the European  
 " Powers are dim indeed. If ever *mathe-*  
 " *matical proofs* were acquired, it is at  
 " present \*." May my countrymen duly reflect on, and timely profit by this hint ! T.

\* Histoire de Polybe, Vol. II. page 329. The Chevalier de Follard died at Avignon, 1752.

CON-

# CONTENTS.

---

	Page
<i>PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE</i>	1
CHAP. I. First Step of the Conspiracy against Kings. —Voltaire and D'Alembert passing from the Hatred of Christianity to the Hatred of Kings	9
CHAP. II. Second Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.—Political Systems of the Sect.— D'Argenson and Montesquieu	43
CHAP. III. Jean Jaques Rousseau's System	99
CHAP. IV. Third Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.—The general Effect of the Sys- tems of Montesquieu and Jean Jaques. —Convention of the Sophisters.—The Coalition of their Plots against the Throne, with their Plots against the Altar	123
CHAP. V.* Fourth Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.—Inundation of Antimonarchical Books.—Fresh Proofs of the Conspiracy	159

\* Has been misprinted Chap. VI.

CHAP.

	Page
CHAP. VI. Fifth Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.—The Democratic Essay at Ge- neva - - -	205
CHAP. VII. Aristocratical Essay in France	232
CHAP. VIII. Essay of the Sophisters against Aristocracy - - -	249
OF MASONRY.	
CHAP. IX. Of the General Secret, or Lesser Mysteries, of Freemasonry - - -	273
CHAP. X. Of the Grand Mysteries or Secrets of the Occult Lodges - - -	293
CHAP. XI. New Proofs of the System and Mysteries of the Occult Masons -	331
CHAP. XII. Proofs of the Origin of Free- masons drawn from their own Systems	359
CHAP. XIII. Farther Declarations of the Freemasons as to their Origin.—The real Founder of Masonry.—True and first Origin of their Mysteries and of all their Systems - - -	399
CHAP. XIV. Sixth Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.—Coalition of the Sophisters and of the Freemasons - - -	424

THE



---

THE  
ANTIMONARCHICAL CONSPIRACY.

---

PRELIMINARY DISCOURSE.

IN this Second Part of the "MEMOIRS ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF JACOBINISM," our object will be to show, how the *Sophisters of Impiety*, becoming the *Sophisters of Rebellion*, after having conspired against every altar, conspire against every throne. We shall demonstrate, that these men under the name of Philosophers, after having sworn to crush Christ and his altars, bound themselves in a second oath to annihilate all regal power.

Plan of  
this 2d  
part.

We have said, in the former part of this work \*, that the *Sophisters of Impiety*, when they were become the *Sophisters also of Rebellion*, had leagued with a sect, long since concealed in the

\* Preliminary Discourse, vol. i. p. xxii.

occult lodges of Freemasonry, whose adepts, like the modern Philosophers, had sworn hatred to the altar and the throne, had sworn to crush the God of the Christians, and utterly to extirpate the Kings of the earth.

This two-fold object naturally divides our Second Volume into two Parts. The first will develop the rise and progress of the Conspiracy of the Sophisters, called Philosophers: The second, of that sect, which we have denominated Occult Masons (*Arrières Maçons*), to distinguish their adepts from the multitude of brethren who were too virtuous to be initiated in the occult mysteries, too religious, and too faithful citizens to associate in their plots.

After having treated separately of these two conspiracies, though both tending to the same object, we shall show them leaguering together; and by their united efforts accomplishing that part of the French Revolution which effected the overthrow of Religion and Monarchy, of the altar and the throne; in a word, which murdered, basely murdered, the unfortunate Lewis XVI. on a scaffold.

Reflex-  
ions on  
the con-  
spiracy  
against  
Kings.

Confining ourselves to facts, and suppressing the powers of imagination, it seems incumbent on us to submit some few reflections to the reader, which, though naturally flowing from the subject, are yet requisite to enable him to follow the progress of the Sophisters in their second conspiracy,  
to

to show by what gradations they passed, or rather with what celerity they were hurried headlong, from the school of impiety to that of rebellion, by the inherent tendency of their principles.

While, under the direction of Voltaire, these pretended Philosophers had merely applied their principles of liberty and equality to matters of faith, and had thence conspired against the God of the gospel, that each might be at liberty to form his own religion, or throw off every religious tie;—during that time, few were the obstacles they had to fear from those various classes of men, which it was chiefly their object to captivate.—During their war against Christianity, the passions proved their most powerful allies. There would be no great difficulty in deluding those unfortunate men, who combat the mysteries which they do not understand, merely to exempt themselves from the restraint of those precepts and the practice of those virtues which are unfavourable to their passions.

Sovereigns, seldom much versed in the science or history of religion; men who often, under the sanction of opulence and the splendour of rank, only seek to throw off all control on their moral conduct; others aspiring at fortune, and caring not by what unwarrantable means they acquire it; vain men panting after an empty name, and ready to sacrifice every truth to a far-

castic meteor, or some blasphemy mistaken for wit, and others who would have had little hope of celebrity had they not directed their genius against their God;—in short, all those men who, easily receiving sophisms for demonstrative proofs, never troubled themselves with the investigation of that *equality of rights*, and that *liberty of reason*, which the conspiring sect represented to them as being incompatible with a religion revealed, and replete with mysteries.

Few even of the adepts had ever reflected on the absurdity of opposing the rights of reason to revelation; as if those pretended rights of our limited reason were to suspend the power of an infinite God who reveals himself, or were to depreciate the truth of his oracles, and of the mission of his Prophets and Apostles. They never had reflected, that the whole question of these rights of reason turned simply on this: to know whether God had spoken or not; and to believe and silently adore whatever might be the nature of the truths he had revealed.

Men so little able to comprehend and to defend the rights of their God, could not have been very dangerous adversaries for the Sophisters, who are perpetually setting this liberty of reason in opposition to the Gospel.

But how different the case, when the sect applying this same liberty and equality to the  
empire

empire of human laws and to civil society, concludes, that after having crushed the altar, it was also necessary to overturn every throne, in order that men might be reinstated in their original Liberty and Equality! A conspiracy on such principles, and drawing after it such consequences, must naturally have been combated by the interests and the passions of the Royal Sophisters, of the protecting Princes, and of all those adepts of the higher classes, who were so docile to the accents of liberty, when those accents only menaced the destruction of the Religion of their God.

Voltaire and D'Alembert could not expect to find Frederic, Joseph II. Catherine III. or Gustavus, of Sweden, much disposed to subvert their respective thrones. It was very probable too, that many other protecting adepts, such as ministers or courtiers, nobles, or wealthy persons distinguished by their rank, would soon perceive the danger of depending on a multitude, who, having thrown off all obedience, would soon grasp at sovereignty itself, and, as the first essay of its power, would level every species of property, and strike off every head which rose above that multitude.

On the side of the Sophisters themselves, though gratitude could have had but little weight with them, yet their interest, their very existence might have abated their eagerness against the throne.

D'Alembert lived on pensions from the Kings of France and Prussia; his very apartment in the Louvre was a gift from Lewis XVI. The Empress of Russia alone supported Diderot's ruined fortune; and the Grand Duke pensioned the adept La Harpe. Damilaville would have been a beggar, if discarded from his office. The Philosophic Sanhedrim of that French Academy composed of so many adepts owed its existence, its means, its counters (*jettons*) to the generosity of the monarch. There were few other scribbling Sophisters who did not either look up to a pension, or had not already obtained one by the intrigues of the protecting ministers.

Voltaire had acquired an independent fortune; but he was not, on that account, the less elated when M. de Choiseul gave him back the pension which, twelve years before, he had lost, on account of his impious writings\*. Beside, nobody knew better than did Voltaire, that he was chiefly indebted for the success of his Antichristian Conspiracy to the royal adepts. He was too proud of numbering among his disciples Imperial and Regal Sovereigns, to conspire against their very existence on earth.

All these motives, therefore, gave quite a different turn to the conspiracy against the Throne,

\* Let. to Damilaville, 9th January 1762.

from

from that which we have already seen erected against the Altar. In the warfare against the Gospel, Liberty and Equality could have been but a shallow pretence ; it was their hatred against Christ by which they were hurried away. It is hardly possible that they could have concealed from themselves that it was rather a war waged by their passions against the virtues of the gospel, than a warfare of reason against the mysteries of Christianity. In the Antimonarchical Conspiracy, the pretext had grown into conviction. The Sophists believed their principles of Liberty and Equality to be demonstrated, they did not even suspect an error in their principles. They believed the war which they waged against Kings, to be a war of justice and of wisdom. In the former conspiracy, it was the passions inventing principles to combat the God of the Christians ; in the latter, it was reason, misled by those same principles, seeking and glorying in the downfall of every crowned head.

Rapid had been the progress of the passions. From his very birth, Voltaire's hatred against Christ had been at its height. Scarcely had he known, ere he hated, scarcely hated when he swore to crush, the God of the Christians. Not such was the progress of the hatred against Kings. This sentiment had, like opinion and conviction, its gradations. The very interest of the Sophi-

sters of Impiety thwarted for a long time the measures of those of Rebellion; many years were necessary to enable the sect to form its systems, to determine its plots, and resolve on its object. Were we to precipitate its steps, we should be guilty of misrepresentation. As faithful historians, it will be incumbent on us, to show this hatred against Kings in its infancy, that is, springing from the hatred against Christ, and successively applying those principles invented against the altar, to the destruction of the throne. This hatred against kings had even in the chiefs of the conspirators its gradations: but their systems will complete the delusion, and root it in the hearts of the adepts. It will bear absolute sway over their secret academy, and there will the same plots be contrived against the throne as Philosophism had framed against the altar. The same means and the same success will combine the conspiracies. The same crimes and the same disasters will combine the revolutions.

---



## CHAP. I.

*First Step in the Conspiracy against Kings.**Voltaire and D'Alembert passing from the Hatred of Christianity to the Hatred of Kings.*

OUR attention to truth and justice with regard <sup>Voltaire</sup> to a man, who was so far from both with respect <sup>at first</sup> to religion, obliges us to begin this chapter by a <sup>friendly</sup> declaration, which might make Voltaire appear to be the farthest from an enemy, much less from being the author of a conspiracy against the throne. If this man, the most unrelenting chief when conspiring against Christianity, had followed the bias of his own inclination; or had he been able to sway his adepts in politics as he had in impiety; never would that oath of destroying the throne have issued from his school.

Voltaire loved kings; their favor and their caresses were his delight; he was even dazzled with their greatness. His sentiments cannot be mistaken, after having seen him glory in singing the praises of Lewis XIV. or Henry IV. kings of France; of Charles XII. king of Sweden; of the Czar Peter Emperor of all the Russias; of Frederick II. king of Prussia; and of so many other kings both of ancient and modern times.

Voltaire

Voltaire had all the habits and manners of the great, and at his court of Ferney acted the Grandee perfectly well. He had too high an opinion of his own abilities to assimilate himself, by Equality, to that multitude which he contemptuously styles, the beggarly *canaille*.

He was not only partial to kings, but even to the monarchical form of government. When he gives a loose to his own sentiments, and in his historical writings, we see him invariably preferring the dominion of ONE to that of the MANY. He could not endure the idea of having so many masters as there were counsellors in the parliament \*; how then could he adopt that liberty and sovereignty of the people which would have given him as joint sovereigns, the towns and suburbs, the peasantry and his own vassals. He who so much delighted in reigning in his own castle, who was so jealous of his prerogatives in the midst of his estates which he called his little Province, how could he wish to sanction a Liberty and Equality which was to level the castle with the cottage?

jealous of  
the title  
of faithful  
subject.

Beside, Voltaire's principal object was to annihilate Christianity; and he feared nothing so much as to be thwarted by the kings in his undertaking, on pretence that he equally aimed his blows at the throne as he did against the altar. It was for this reason that he perpetually warns the adepts of what

\* Let. to D'Alembert.

confe-

consequence it was, that the Philosophers should be considered as faithful subjects. When assuring Marmontel how much he (Voltaire) was protected by Choiseul and the courtesan Pompadour, he writes, that they may send him any thing without danger. " They know that we love the king and  
 " the state. It was not among us that such people  
 " as Damien heard the voice of rebellion. I am  
 " draining a bog, I am building a church, and I  
 " *pray for the king*. We defy either Jansenist or  
 " Molinist to have a greater attachment for the  
 " king than we have. My dear friend, the king  
 " must be acquainted that the Philosophers *are*  
 " *more attached to him* than all the fanatics and hy-  
 " pocrites in his kingdom \*."

It was the self-same motive which induced him to write to Helvetius (that Sophister whom we shall see so unrelenting in his hatred to kings), "*It is the king's interest* that the number of Philosophers should augment, and that of the Fanatics diminish. We are quiet, and they are all disturbers of the peace; *we are citizens*, they are the children of sedition. *The faithful servants of the king*, and of reason, shall triumph at Paris, at Vorei, and even at the Délices †."

Apprehensive, however, that the Philosophers might be suspected, notwithstanding all his pro-

\* 13th August, 1760.

† 27th October, 1760.

testations,

testations, he had already written thus to D'Alembert; "Do you know who the bad citizen is that wishes to persuade the Dauphin that France is overrun with the enemies of religion? They will not pretend to say, I hope, that Peter Damiens, Francis Ravallac, and their predecessors were Deists and Philosophers." Nevertheless, he ends his letter by saying, "I fear that Peter Damiens will be a great detriment to Philosophy \*."

Defends  
the autho-  
rity of  
Kings.

Finally, if any thing can paint in strong colours Voltaire's attachment to kings, it will be the method in which he treats those of the adepts who dared attack the authority of the sovereign. The adept Thiriot had sent him a work on the *Theory of Taxation*, and Voltaire answers, "Received the *Theory of Taxation*, an obscure theory, and apparently to me an absurd one. All such theories are very ill timed, as they only serve to make foreign nations believe that our resources are exhausted, and that they may insult and attack us with impunity. *Such men are very extraordinary citizens indeed, and curious friends to man.* Let them come where I am on the frontiers, and *they will presently change their opinions. They will soon see how necessary it is that the king and the state should be respected. Upon my word, at Paris people see every thing topsy-turvy †.*"

\* 16th January, 1757.

† 11th January, 1761.

The

- The staunchest Royalist could not have insisted in a clearer manner on the necessity of supporting the Royal authority ; nevertheless, he had already let fall many expressions which little denoted any zeal for the cause of kings. He had not adopted, as yet, that Philosophism of rebellion, of Liberty and Equality, which was to fanaticise the French people, and raise Robespierres and Marats in succession to the fanatics Ravaillac and Damiens. There were times even when he would have treated the Mirabeaux, La Fayette and Baillys, as he used sometimes to treat those mad Œconomists; who, attacking the authority of kings, saw, through their pretended theory, every thing in a wrong light. But this love for his king was but a remnant of his first education, which Philosophism had often belied, and of which the very trace would soon be erased from the heart of the Sophister.

Had Voltaire, either from his own sentiments, or for the interest of the sect, been still more desirous of being looked upon as a good citizen, or a faithful subject to the king, yet the adepts could have retorted the arguments he had perpetually repeated to stir them up against Christianity, in too powerful a manner against his arguments in favor of kings, for him to have been able to withstand them. It was but natural that men who had been taught to oppose their Liberty and Equality

Declines  
towards  
Liberty  
and Equality.

to

to the God of revelation, to his ministers and prophets, should also oppose them to the kings of the earth. Voltaire had taught them that the Equality of rights and Liberty of reason were incompatible with that power of the church and of the gospel commanding a submission to and a belief in mysteries which were inconceivable by reason. The adepts, as the next step, declare that the equality of men, the liberty of nature, were equally incompatible with any submission to the empire and laws of *one* man, or even of *many*, whether called parliaments or senates, lords or princes, pretending to the dominion over a whole nation, and dictating laws to the multitude, who had neither made them, discussed them, nor wished for them.

These principles, so forcibly insisted on by Voltaire when combating Christianity, might naturally be objected to his propositions respecting submission to the sovereign; and they were so. The adepts urged the consequences, and the premier chief was unwilling to lose the pre-eminence, over his own school, in what he called Philosophy. The process by which he was led from the Sophistry of Impiety to that of Rebellion, is too much blended with the progress of his anti-religious Philosophism, not to be worthy of investigation.

Voltaire

Voltaire had been actuated by no other passion than that of hatred against Christ, when in the year 1718 he caused to be publicly recited in his tragedy of *Œdipus* those two famous verses, which alone comprehend the whole of that anti-religious revolution which was to be accomplished seventy years afterward:

Priests are not what they seem to vulgar eyes,  
In our credulity their science lies \*.

These two lines only proclaim that Equality of rights and Liberty of reason which, disavowing the authority or mission of the clergy, leave the people at full liberty to form their religious tenets on whatever they may please to call their reason. But many years elapsed before Voltaire could form a correct idea of that liberty and equality which was to divest the monarch of his rights, as he had divested the church of her's. It even appears that he had not at that time any idea of deducing from this liberty and equality principles so fatal to monarchy; that he was perfectly ignorant of what Liberty and Equality, applied to civil society, meant, when he published his epistles or discourses on Liberty and Equality in 1738. The first lessons he received on the subject were from his *élève* Thiriot, whom he had

---

\* Les prêtres ne sont pas ce qu'un vain peuple pense;  
Notre crédulité fait toute leur science;

left

left in England, and from whom he wished to learn what opinion the adepts had formed on those epistles. Or, as is more probable, Thiriot, knowing his master's bias for aristocracy, only wrote that he had not sufficiently *gone to the point*, and that he was not in complete possession of the true principles. Piqued at such a reproach, Voltaire, like a man who did not care to see himself outdone by his disciples, writes, "A word on the Epistles. Where the devil do you find that they do not go to the point. There is not a single verse in the first epistle, which does not show the *equality of conditions*, nor one in the second which does not prove *liberty* \*."

Notwithstanding this reply, the disciple was in the right. He might have rejoined, that throughout the whole of the Epistles there was not a single verse which, philosophically speaking, was not a misconstruction; since, in the first, all that Voltaire aimed at proving was, that in all stations of life the sum total of happiness was nearly the same; and in the second, liberty is considered much more as a physical faculty, than as a natural, civil, and political right. The inference drawn from the first is, that it is useless for man to trouble himself about the difference of stations as the same portion of happiness is

\* Letter to Thiriot, 24th October 1738.

nearly



nearly allotted to each; the second does not even mention that liberty which the adepts so much insist on against kings, and only asserts that liberty which so well demonstrates the distinction of right and wrong, and which the sect always looked upon as too favorable to religion.

Without seeming to submit to his disciples, Voltaire, nevertheless, gradually adopted their sentiments; vexed at having asserted the rights of free agency, he counteracted all the influence that doctrine might have had, and gave his definition of liberty \* such a turn, that Predestinarians themselves could not have cavilled at it. In a word, he no longer asserted any other liberty than that which has proved such a powerful weapon against sovereignty in the hands of the sect.

The

\* If we are to believe this definition, *Liberty* consists in *the power of doing what we will*. A true metaphysician would say, *The power itself, the faculty of willing or not willing*, that is to say, *of determining one's will, of choosing and willing any thing, or the contrary*. These two definitions are very different. It is not the *power* but the *will* which is culpable. A righteous man has frequently the same power of committing the same crime as the wicked man; but one wills it, while the other does not. The wicked man is at liberty *not* to will it, as the upright man is at liberty to will it; otherwise, there can be no moral difference between the good and the bad man. For how could the latter be culpable, if he had not had it in his power to will

Vol. II. C the

The corrections he made in his Epistle on Equality, had a more direct affinity to the system of the political revolution. In the first edition of that Epistle we read,

Equal the state, in men the difference lies \*.

The sect wished him to have said,

Equal are men, in states the difference lies †.

At length Voltaire understood their meaning, and blushed at finding that his own disciples had made a greater progress in the knowledge of Equality than he had himself; and to avoid their future criticisms he changed both his doctrine and his verses. He corrected, and almost reconstructed his Epistle on Equality; nor did he

the contrary? Suppose three men—the first *can* commit a bad action, but his will *freely rejects* it: The second *can* accomplish the same, and he *freely wills* it: The third not only *can* but he *irresistibly wills* it. The first of these men will be a virtuous man, the second a wicked man, the third a mere brutal machine, a madman who is neither master of his will nor of his reason. The wicked man and the mad one could and did will the same action. The difference does not lie in the power or the action, but in the will itself more or less free to will or not to will. But Voltaire and his sophistical school had their reasons for not making such distinctions.

\* Les Etats sont égaux, mais les hommes différent:

† Les hommes sont égaux, et les états différent!

let

let his poetic genius rest, till he had shown the adepts, that he understood the equality of man as well as they did, and that they could no longer reproach him with not *going to the point*. It was then that he wrote the following verses, which contain all that the revolutionary populace have alledged against the wealthy, the nobility, and kings, in proof of its equality.

With calm indifference let my friend survey  
The pomp of riches and despotic sway;  
This world's a ball, where his undazzled eyes  
Pierce thro' each silly actor's vain disguise.  
My Lord, your Highness, are the masks that hide  
Their little beings and exalt their pride;  
*But, men are equal; pride do what you can,*  
*The mask may differ but the same the man.*  
The five weak senses by us all possess,  
Of good, of evil, are our only test.  
*A slave has five, fix can the Monarch claim?*  
The same his body and his soul the same \*.

\* Tu vois, cher Ariston, d'un œil d'indifférence  
La grandeur tyrannique, et la fiere opulence.  
Tes yeux d'un faux éclat ne sont point abusés;  
Ce monde est un grand bal, où des fous déguisés,  
Sous les risibles noms d'Eminence et d'Altesse,  
Pensent enfler leur être et hausser leur bassesse.  
Envain des vanités l'appareil nous surprend;  
*Les mortels sont égaux, le masque est différent.*  
Nos cinq sens imparfaits, donnés par la nature,  
De nos biens, de nos maux sont la seule mesure.  
*Les Rois en ont-ils fix? et leur ame et leur corps*  
*Sont-ils d'une autre espèce? ont-ils d'autres ressorts?*

This is precisely what the democratic rabble of Paris was wont to say, less elegantly indeed, when it asked whether kings and nobles were not made of the same clay as the simple clown? Whether those who enjoyed large fortunes had two stomachs? And of what use were all those distinctions of Sovereigns, Princes, or Chevaliers, since *all men were equal*?

It was with reluctance, it must be confessed, that Voltaire became the Apostle of Equality. For without having a body or soul of a different species from that of Pompignan, Freron, or Desfontaines, or of so many other men whom he was perpetually overwhelming with his sarcasms, he nevertheless was aware that in the same species, and with the same nature, there existed no small inequality among men; that without being endowed with a sixth sense, he felt the great distance there was between himself and the rabble he so much despised. At length he submitted to the criticisms of the adepts, and after having declared

Equal the state, in men the difference lies \*.

he writes in absolute opposition,

The mask may differ but the same the man †.

\* Les Etats sont égaux, mais les hommes différent †.

† Les mortels sont égaux, le masque est différent §.

‡ 1st and 2d Edit.

§ See the variations, edit. of Kell.

As

As to that liberty which commences in the love of Republicanism, and ends in the hatred of Kings, it is probable that Voltaire would never have adopted it, had it not been necessary to establish that liberty which was essential to the hatred of Christ; but he had found himself too much thwarted by the authority of Kings in his first publications against Christianity. In Holland he enjoyed a greater liberty for printing his blasphemies; and it was to that circumstance, that he owed his bias for Republicanism. Those who have read his correspondence while in Holland, and particularly the following letter to the Marquis D'Argenson, dated from the Hague, will not have a doubt that this was the case. “ I am, says he, “ better pleased even with the abuses of the liberty “ of the press here, than with that sort of slavery “ under which the human mind is kept in France. “ If you continue on that plan, the simple remembrance of the glorious age of Lewis XIV. “ will be all that will remain. This degeneracy “ almost inclines me to settle in the country I am “ now in. The Hague is a charming residence ; “ *liberty alleviates the rigors of the winter. I like to “ see the Rulers of the State no more than plain Citizens.* There are factions, it is true, yet they “ must exist in Republics : But faction does not “ damp patriotism, and I see great men contending with great men.—On the other side I see,

C 3.

“ with

Becomes  
a Republican;

“ with equal admiration, the chief members of  
 “ the state walking on foot without servants,  
 “ living in houses worthy of those Roman Consuls  
 “ who dressed their own roots ; you would like  
 “ this government extremely, notwithstanding all  
 “ those imperfections which are unavoidable in it.  
 “ *It is entirely municipal, and that is what you ad-  
 “ mire \*.*”

All these expressions naturally denote a man  
 declining towards a Republican Liberty and Equa-  
 lity, and who impatiently bore the yoke of Kings.  
 A few years after, we may observe this passion  
 much more predominant in Voltaire, especially in  
 a letter which he is supposed to have written to an  
 Academician of Marseilles, and mentioned in Mr.  
 de Bevis's Memoirs. “ I should accept your  
 “ invitation, were Marseilles still a Grecian Re-  
 “ public ; for I greatly admire Academies, *but am  
 “ much more partial to Republics.* How happy are  
 “ those countries where our masters visit us, and  
 “ are not affronted when we do not return to wait  
 “ on them !”

In all this, however, we see nothing more than  
 a partiality for Republics ; it was not positively a  
 hatred of Kings, nor an imputation of tyranny and  
 despotism in the regal government. But a few  
 years after this, that same rancour is directed by  
 Voltaire against the throne, which he had already

\* Let. 8th August, 1743.

conceived against the altar. Such at least is clearly the purport of a confidential letter which he writes to D'Alembert, wherein he says, "As to Duluc (the King of Prussia), sometimes biting sometimes bitten, he must be a most unhappy mortal; *and those men who put themselves in the way of a musket or a sabre for such gentry, are most abominable fools.* Don't betray my secret either to Kings or Priests \*."

His secret  
on Kings;

This, however, could be no secret to those who had observed the modern Sophisters trying to cast all the odium of war and its miseries on Kings and the nature of their governments, and wishing to persuade the people that their only way of acquiring happiness, and everlasting peace, was, to take the government into their own hands by wresting it from their Royal Masters. This proposition, so evidently contradicted by that perpetual state of warfare, interior or exterior, so common to Republics, evinces that Voltaire had no care about proof, when he decided in so peremptory a stile, that those who were persuaded they were fighting for their country when rallied under the standard of their King, were most abominable fools.

We should particularly remark in this letter, how much his secret with regard to Kings is con-

\* 12th December, 1757.

ned with that respecting *the Priesthood* ; and he had more than once publicly divulged them both. The latter he had expressed in the verses already quoted from his Tragedy of *Œdipus*,

Priests are not what they seem to vulgar eyes,  
In our credulity their science lies \*:

and as to the former, we see Voltaire by the same means teaching the people what they are to think with regard to Sovereigns, their rights, and their origin ; or with regard to the Nobility, who are perpetually led and spurred on to the defence of their country in emulation of those services by which their ancestors distinguished themselves. It would be in vain to excuse the poet : it is a hatred of Kings, and not the genius of poetry, which inspires such artful turns, and makes the dramatic actor speak the sentiments of the Sophister. It certainly was not the love of Monarchy which dictated the following verses, and caused them to be spoken on the stage of a nation under the dominion of a King, and proud of the achievements of its Nobility. In his Tragedy of *Mérope*, he says,

His principles  
against  
Kings.

Some lucky soldier was the first of Kings ;  
Who serves the state, no matter whence he springs †.

---

\* Les prêtres ne sont pas ce qu'un vain peuple pense ;  
Notre credulité fait toute leur science :

† Le premier qui fut Roi, fut un soldat heureux,  
Que sert bien son Pays, n'a pas besoin d'ayeux.

When



When Voltaire taught this doctrine to the French people, the Antimonarchical Revolution had made as great a progress in his mind, as the Antichristian formerly had, when the verses already quoted had been spoken against the Clergy. But nothing short of the most abandoned Jacobinism could testify applause when Voltaire continues, *Do you wish to be happy? Never own a master* \*.

It was thus that Voltaire, carried away by his System of Liberty opposed to the Altar, daily cherished the sentiments of that liberty which was to combat the throne. Nor was it inadvertently that these maxims escaped from his poetic genius. In his correspondence with D'Alembert, his intention appears clearly when he points out to his confidant, all those verses which may teach the subject to rise in judgment against his King, or even to become his assassin or executioner, should he ever chuse to view his Prince in the light of a tyrant or a despot. Exactly such are the passages which he wishes D'Alembert to notice, when he writes, " Last year I hurried over a Play called *The Laws of Minos*, which presently you will see hissed. In those *Laws of Minos*, Teucer " says to Merion the Senator,

Our laws a change, our state a King requires †.

---

\* Dialogues of the Philosophers on Happiness.

† " Il faut changer de loix, il faut avoir un maitre.

The

The Senator answers :

Of me, my treasures and my life dispose,  
But should the pow'r this sovereign rank bestows  
Be turn'd against our laws and native land,  
Then shall my arm that guilty pow'r withstand\*.

Had Voltaire ever met with such verses in the writings of a Clergyman, he would immediately have attacked him as an assassin and a traitor ; he would have exclaimed, Behold the subject who raises himself in judgment against his Sovereign, who takes upon him the right of deciding between his King and the Laws, the right of attacking and combating his King, and of turning his sword against him, every time it may please him to believe, or to persuade the people, that the death of the Prince would restore energy to the laws.— Voltaire would have immediately added, there we see the people decidedly created both judge and sovereign over their Kings ; such are the maxims which form Rebels, and produce Revolutions with all their concomitant horrors of democratic anarchy.

What Voltaire would very properly have said on this affectation of their making a distinction be-

- 
- \* “ Je vous offre mon bras, mes trésors & mon sang ;
  - “ Mais si vous abusez de ce suprême rang,
  - “ Pour fouler a vos pieds les loix & la patrie,
  - “ Je la defends, Seigneur, au péril de ma vie †.”

† Letter of 13th November, 1772.

tween

tween the King and the Country, history may as properly apply to Voltaire himself; more particularly as nobody knew the consequences and danger of such maxims better than he did; nor did he even make any secret of their dangerous tendency when writing to his friends. He begins his letter to the Count D'Argental on sending him some of those seditious publications, by saying, "In the first place, promise me upon oath, that you never will let my *petit pâtés* out of your hands, that you will send them back to me, and inform me whether they are too highly seasoned, or whether the general taste of the day is more depraved than my own. *The forcemeat of my petit pâtés is not quite palatable to a monarchy; but you told me that a dish of Brutus* had been lately served up at the Count de Falkenstein's (the name under which Joseph II. travelled), and that none of the guests had left the table \*." Such language is not very enigmatical; but it paints Voltaire in very different colours from those we have seen him in, when reproaching his Parisian brethren with seeing every thing *topsy-turvy* in their attack on the King's power. It denotes an author who dares not yet show his sentiments so opposite to that power, but who wishes to go as far as possible without exposing himself to danger. We see him flattering himself that he has not been

His secret and indirect attack against the throne.

• 27th July, 1777.

too

too daring, as Joseph II. had been imprudent enough *to let a dish of Brutus be served up at his table*; that is to say, that monarch had heard broached at his table, without shewing his displeasure, doctrines the most dangerous and threatening to the lives of Sovereigns.

He wishes  
for and  
foretells  
the Revolution.

There are many other letters extant, which indicate how deeply this Antimonarchical liberty had rooted itself in the heart of Voltaire, and even how much he despised that love for their Sovereign at that time so universally prevalent among the French people. There is one in particular, in which he complains most bitterly, that strangers perfectly conversant in the catechism of liberty, and equal to the task of teaching it to the Parisians, are obliged to carry their systems elsewhere, before they have succeeded in teaching them to the French people; that if man was created to serve God, *he was also created to be free* \*. In short, what displeased Voltaire more particularly was, that while he was making such progress in this catechism of liberty, the French people, whom he calls his *Velches*, did not keep pace with him †. When the Historian shall treat of the progress which Voltaire was making in the arts of liberty, he shall not extenuate his error, by saying that Voltaire was not aware of the fatal consequences of a revo-

\* Letter to Damilaville, 23d March, 1764.

† Ibid. & passim.

lution,

lution, or that he would have started back from his purpose could he by possibility have foreseen them. Certainly his soul could not be so ferocious as to have aspired after the bloody reign of a Robespierre; but he complacently foretells, and offers up his prayers for a revolution, which he knows to be big with bloodshed and surrounded with firebrands; and, however disastrous such revolutionary scourges may appear to him, he nevertheless deems those persons happy, who, from their juvenility, may live to see them. He writes to the Marquis de Chauvelin, " Every thing is  
 " preparing the way to a *great revolution*, which  
 " will most *undoubtedly take place*; and I shall not  
 " *be fortunate enough to see it*. The French arrive  
 " at every thing slowly, but still they do arrive.  
 " Light has so gradually diffused itself, that on the  
 " first opportunity the nation will break out, *and*  
 " *the uproar will be glorious*. *Happy those who are*  
 " *now young, for they will behold most extraordinary*  
 " *things* \*."

Let the reader notice the date of this letter, which is twenty-five years anterior to the French revolution. During the whole of that long period we shall never observe Voltaire reproaching the adepts with seeing every thing *topsy-turvy*, when they attack the Royal prerogative.

\* 2d March, 1764.

Whether

Whether it was that the victories he had obtained over the altar gave him more confidence in his attacks against the Throne; or that the success of his sarcastic attacks gradually made against kings with impunity, had persuaded him that they were not so formidable as he had believed them, either to himself or to his adepts; which of these was the true reason we cannot now determine. This however is certain, that so far from being startled at the principles of insurrection inculcated throughout the writings of his disciples, he hugs himself in the idea that their productions were becoming the catechisms of all nations.

When Diderot published his *System of Nature*, it was neither his attacks nor his frantic declamations against kings, that the Philosopher of Ferney sought to combat; but a kind of metaphysics the absurdity of which, he feared, would reflect on Philosophy. Yet, notwithstanding this absurdity, and the violent declamations against sovereignty, we find him exulting with D'Alembert in the success of that abominable work, and bragging of its being *so greedily read throughout all Europe*, that people *snatched it* from each other. When he saw the courtiers and princes, encouraging new editions of Helvetius's work ON MAN AND HIS EDUCATION, notwithstanding the seditious and antimonarchical principles it contained, and which will be noticed in the course of this work, Voltaire,

so

so far from fearing the indignation of kings, which such writings would naturally draw down on his school of Philosophers, smiles exultingly with D'Alembert at the great success of the work, and receives it as a proof that *the flock of sages silently increased* \*.

Thus it is that all his fears of irritating Sovereigns, by this apostleship of Liberty and Equality gradually subside, and are succeeded by that thirst of revolution, of *riot*, and of those tempestuous scenes which were to accompany the downfall of Emperors and Kings, in a word, of all Sovereigns, or, in their philosophical cant, of tyrants and despots.

Our readers, and future ages, will naturally inquire, whether D'Alembert walked in the footsteps of his dear master; whether, as zealous as Voltaire for the Anti-christian liberty, he also adopted that liberty so inimical to royalty. Let D'Alembert speak for himself: His answer is contained in a letter already quoted, but which may throw new light on this question.

“ You love REASON AND LIBERTY, my dear brother; and a man can hardly love the one without loving *the other*. Well then, here is a worthy *Republican Philosopher* whom I present

\* Letter to D'Alembert, 16th July 1770. No. 114 and 117, anno 1773, and to the Duchess of Choiseul, 1770.

“ to

“ to you, who will talk with you on PHILOSOPHY  
 “ AND LIBERTY: It is Mr. Jennings, chamber-  
 “ lain to the king of Sweden, a man of great me-  
 “ rit and enjoying a high degree of reputation in  
 “ his own country. He is worthy of your ac-  
 “ quaintance, both for his own merit, and for the  
 “ uncommon esteem he has for your writings,  
 “ *which have so much contributed toward disseminat-*  
 “ *ing those two principles among persons worthy of*  
 “ *feeling them \*.*”

What an avowal is this for a man like D'Alembert, who was extremely cautious in his expressions, and always on his guard, lest he should utter any thing that might expose him to danger. *You love Reason and Liberty; and a man can hardly love the one, without loving the other.* A few lines lower, we find this *Reason* to be Philosophy; and the subsequent *Liberty* to be that of a Republican Philosopher; who nevertheless lives under a monarchy, loaded with the favors, and enjoying the confidence of his Sovereign. It is D'Alembert then who avows, that one can hardly love his pretended Philosophy, without loving Republicanism, or *that liberty* which he believes not to exist under Monarchy.

It is D'Alembert again who selects from among the numerous claims which may entitle the sophi-

• Letter to Voltaire, 19th January 1769.



tical courtier to Voltaire's or his own esteem, that of his love for Republican Philosophy ; though he certainly could not cultivate such a disposition, without secretly wishing to betray the cause of his King.

In short, it is D'Alembert who extolls the writings of his dear and illustrious brother, as peculiarly adapted to disseminate *those two principles of Republican Liberty and Republican Philosophy among persons worthy of feeling them* ; or, in other words, as peculiarly adapted to fulfil the wishes of those pretended sages, who can find no liberty under the government of Kings, and who detest Monarchy in proportion to their love for Republics. He who believes himself worthy of feeling this *two-fold sentiment*, he who acknowledges no Philosophy as true if void of these two sentiments, could he, I ask, demonstrate in a more forcible manner, how ardently they glowed in his heart, or how much he panted after those revolutions which were to crush the throne, and establish Republicanism on its ruin ?

In drawing these inferences, let not the reader suppose that we mean to confound in all cases a bias for Republics, or the love of Liberty, with the hatred of Kings, and the desire of subverting every Throne. We are perfectly aware, that there exist many worthy Republicans, who, while they love their own Government, are not unmindful of the

VOL. II.

D

respect

respect due to those of other Nations. Nor are we ignorant that true Civil Liberty is no less compatible with Monarchies than with Republics: indeed, it might not be difficult to prove, that the subject frequently enjoys a more real and extensive Liberty under a Kingly, than under a Republican Government, especially if a Democracy. But when we behold the Sophisters perpetually complaining of the Government of Kings under whom they live, styling their Sovereigns Despots, and sighing after the Liberty of the Republican Philosopher, we are certainly entitled to view their love for Liberty and Republicanism as blended with the hatred of Kings. If their blasphemies against Christ, if what they call their Philosophy be by any means thwarted, impatient of the rein, they burst forth into complaint, and they exclaim, that *Reason is shackled*; that Despotism, *Decius like, perpetually persecutes them*; or, that *man is unfortunate indeed* when he lives under the eye of a Monarch, or of his Ministers\*.

But to confine ourselves to D'Alembert, let us recal to mind, that in the warfare against the altar, he acted the part of the fox. We shall see him employing the same cunning in his attack against the Throne. He will excite and stimulate others, he will even guide their pens; but he carefully

\* See Voltaire's and D'Alembert's correspondence *passim*.

avoids

avoids every thing by which he might himself be eventually endangered. It is thus that he lauds Voltaire, that he extols the zeal with which his dear brother propagates that Republican Liberty and Philosophy; and fearing lest this zeal should sometime abate, he adds, "Continue to fight as you do, *pro aris et focis*; as for me, *my hands are tied by ministerial and sacerdotal tyranny*; I can only follow the example of Moses, and raise up my hands to heaven while you contend in fight\*."

Again, we find him informing Voltaire of the eagerness with which he reads and devours all those writings in which that Premier Chief had combined his attacks against the Altar and the Throne. We see him applauding his sarcastic wit, and thus addressing him: "I am almost angry when I learn from public report, that without informing me of it you have given a slap to Fanaticism and Tyranny, and that without detriment to the swingeing blows which you apply in so masterly a manner on other occasions. You enjoy alone the privilege of covering with odium and ridicule those two pests of society†."

During this warfare, it was not the good fortune of all the adepts to gain the applause of D'Alembert. They had not, like Voltaire, the art of

\* 19th January, 1769.

† Letter from D'Alembert, 14th July, 1767.

pleasing or amusing Kings, who did not perceive that the sarcastic wit and satire of his romances and historical productions fell on their own heads, though seemingly aimed only at the persons of other Kings.

It was not every one of the adepts that had the art of throwing the living into contempt, by striking at the dead; of flattering the person of the Sovereign, and rendering sovereignty odious; nor shall we find D'Alembert equally pleased with all those who appear in array against the Royal cause. Some of them, too eager, said too much; others were awkward in their attacks, and these he styles *bunglers who are to be found every where* \*. Others again were not sufficiently bold. He will allow them wit, but he wishes *them to be less favorable to Despotism*; and the reader will easily conceive what he would have written himself if his *hands had not been tied*, when he confidentially writes to Voltaire, *I hate Despots almost as much as you do yourself* †.

It would be futile to object, that the hatred of Despotism does not infer the hatred of Kings. We know that; but who are the Despots implied by our Sophisters, if not the Kings under whom they lived. Were the Emperor of the Turks, or the Grand Mogul, who had nothing to do with our Philosophers, the objects of their repeated

\* 24th January, 1778.

† 23d January, 1770.

complaints and hatred? Such objections are unworthy of being noticed. Their language is known; and sufficient proofs will occur to show, that with the sect *Despots or Tyrants and Sovereigns or Kings* are synonymous terms. The very affectation of confounding them together shows that the hatred of the one and of the other were blended in the hearts of the Chiefs and of their Adept.

In short, the compliments of D'Alembert are not the sole proofs with which the adepts have furnished us of the great part Voltaire had taken in that revolution so fatal to Monarchy, and which he so exultingly foresaw. Had he never aimed his sarcastic wit, so much admired by the sophisters, at the persons of Kings, still he would have been the man, at least in the eyes of his school, who had smoothed the way, who had scaled the rampart, to assail the Throne and shiver the Scepter of the pretended Tyrants; in a word, to contrive what the French Revolution has since accomplished, both with respect to the crown and person of the unfortunate Lewis XVI.

These important services are thus appreciated by Condorcet: " Shall (says he) men who would still have been slaves to prejudice if Voltaire had not written, accuse him of betraying the cause of Liberty!—They cannot understand that if Voltaire had inserted in his writings the principles of the elder Brutus, that is to say,

Avowal of the sect concerning Voltaire.

" those

" those of the American Act of Independence,  
 " neither Montesquieu nor Rousseau could have  
 " published their works. Had he, as the Author  
 " of the System of Nature did, obliged all the  
 " Kings of Europe to support the ascendancy of  
 " the Clergy, Europe would still have remained  
 " *in the bonds of slavery and buried in superstition.*  
 " They will not reflect, that in our writings, as  
 " in our actions, we are to make no more than a  
 " necessary display of courage \*."

Condorcet, in writing this, seems to have considered himself as having displayed a sufficient courage, as he did not think it necessary to say, that the throne would have remained unshaken, if Voltaire had not begun by eradicating religion from the minds of the people. His brethren the hebdomadary adepts, criticized the panegyrist as not having sufficiently extolled the services which Voltaire had rendered. At that period the French Revolution was at its summit. Lewis XVI. was reduced to a mere phantom of royalty in his palace, or rather prison, of the Thuilleries. The literary part of the *Mercure* was conducted by La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort; and these reviewers undertake to inform the unfortunate Monarch of the hand which had wrought the downfall of his throne. In giving an account of

\* Life of Voltaire, edit. Kell.

the life of Voltaire, written by the Marquis de Condorcet, the hebdomadary Philosophers speak in the following terms :

“ It appears that it would have been possible to  
 “ show in a clearer light, *the eternal obligations*  
 “ *which human nature has to Voltaire.* Circum-  
 “ stances were favorable. *He did not foresee all that*  
 “ *he has done, but he has done all that we now see.*  
 “ The enlightened observer and the able historian  
 “ will prove to those who are capable of reflexion,  
 “ *that the first Author of the great Revolution, which*  
 “ *astonishes all Europe, which infuses hope into the*  
 “ *hearts of nations, and disquiet into courts, was,*  
 “ *without doubt, Voltaire.* He was the first who  
 “ levelled that formidable rampart of Despotism,  
 “ the religious and sacerdotal power. Had he  
 “ not broken the yoke of Priests, that of Tyrants  
 “ never could have been shaken off; both equally  
 “ weighed upon our necks, and were so intimately  
 “ interwoven, that, the first once slackened, the  
 “ latter must soon have lost its hold. The hu-  
 “ man mind is no more to be impeded in the  
 “ career of independence than it is in that of sla-  
 “ very; and it was Voltaire who shook off the  
 “ yoke, by teaching it to judge, in every respect,  
 “ those who kept it in subjection. It was he who  
 “ rendered reason popular; and if the people had  
 “ not learned to think, never would it have known  
 “ its own strength. The reflexions of the sage

D 4

“ pre-

“ prepare *Political Revolutions*, but it is the arm  
 “ of the people which executes them \*.”

Result of  
 these  
 avowals.

Had I no other object in view than to demonstrate that these men, styling themselves Philosophers, and glorying in the school and name of Voltaire, chiefly aimed at the overthrow of Monarchy when they attacked religion; that it was to the successful warfare which Voltaire had carried on against the religion of Christ that they peculiarly attribute their success against the Throne; that by the appellation of Tyrant and Despot they pointed at the best of Kings and most rightful of Sovereigns: had this been my only object, I say, it would have been useless to continue these Memoirs on the Antimonarchical Conspiracy, or that of the Sophisters of Rebellion against every King.

And who are these Sophisters that declare so openly and so expressly the secret of the sect? First view Condorcet, the most resolute Atheist, the dearest of the brethren, the steady support of Voltaire's hopes, the most intimate confidant of D'Alembert †. It is he who sets out by declaring, that, if Voltaire had not combated Religious prejudices, or that if he had attacked Regal authority

\* *Mercure de France*, Saturday, 7th August, 1790. No. 18, p. xxvi.

† See the first part of these Memoirs.



in a more direct manner, France would have remained enslaved.

Next on the list we find the Journalists La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort, who, in the most celebrated journal of the sect, complain that Condorcet has not shown sufficient courage, and that he is not sufficiently explicit on the pretended *eternal obligations* which mankind have to Voltaire, who by shaking religion to its foundations has overturned the Throne, who by the ruin of the Pontiff has struck the Tyrant.

And who is the Tyrant, the Despot over whom they so loudly triumph? A King whose very name echoes to that of justice and goodness; a Monarch almost adored by his people, and who loved them to a degree of weakness; for he very often repeated, that he would not suffer one drop of his subjects blood to be spilt in his defence.

Will history believe, that the unfortunate Lewis XVI. was the Despot over whom they triumph. And yet if any King upon earth should believe that he is not comprehended in the general subversion aimed at by the conspirators, let him hearken: It is not of France alone that they speak, but of *all mankind*: it is mankind that they pretend to behold enslaved under Kings; and that *hope* which they had infused into the heart of man, is the same which they joyfully observe expanding  
itself

itself through all nations ! If now tranquil on his throne, let him remember, that he is destitute of the prudence which even the Conspirators suppose him to be endowed with. They believe *disquiet to be infused into every Court* ; for they well know, that their principles and their lawless attempts openly menaced monarchy. Yes, that their conspiracy was universal, is already evident ; history needs no farther proof : But before they dared proclaim it, that conspiracy had its gradations ; its means are to be laid open. The first step is that hatred against the throne, flowing in the hearts of the chiefs, from the hatred they had conceived against their God. The second will be found in the investigation of those systems devised by the adepts to overthrow regal authority, and substitute another in its stead. The teachers of the sect had applied the vague principles of Liberty and Equality to Religious tenets ; and hence originated the hatred of Christ and his Church. From the same principles applied to politics arose those theories and systems of subversion, with which the sect assails every throne.

CHAP.

## CHAP. II.

*Second Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.**Political Systems of the Set.**D'Argenson and Montesquieu.*

AMONG the adepts who must have foreseen the consequences which naturally ensued from the application of a pretended equality of rights, and of an irreligious liberty, to politics, none could have done so more intuitively than the Marquis D'Argenson. This man, minister of the foreign department, had lived during the greater part of his life near the person of his Sovereign, and enjoyed that favour, to which he was thought to be entitled by having consecrated his life in the Royal service. Yet he was the man who, during the reign of Lewis XV. drew the outlines of those Sophisticated Systems, which were to oppose Regal authority, and gradually metamorphose the French Monarchy into a Republic.

We have seen Voltaire, as early as the year 1743, extolling the affection which this Marquis bore to Equality, to Liberty, and to the Municipal Government. These praises of the Premier Chief evidently show, that Mr. D'Argenson had already  
con-

conceived his Municipalizing System, and all those wild plans, which the future rebels, under the title of a Constituent Assembly, were to adopt as one of the leading features of their Royal Democracy, at once the most senseless and most seditious as well as the most heterogeneous form of government that could be conceived, and more especially for Frenchmen: They also prove, that he made no secret of his plans to his confidants and co-operators.

His system consists in the division and subdivision of the Provinces into small States, first called *Provincial Administrations* by Necker, and afterwards termed *Departments* by Target and Mirabeau.

According to D'Argenson's plan, resumed and corrected by Turgot and Necker, each of those petty states was, under the inspection of the King, to be charged with the interior administration of its districts, and the levying of taxes; to superintend the different plans adopted for the relief of the people; to inspect the hospitals, the high roads, the establishments useful to commerce and other such objects. The administrators could not determine on any subject of importance without the orders of his Majesty, and this was judged a sufficient fence to the Royal prerogative, especially as at the first formation of these provincial administrations, one half of the members were to be nomi-

nominated by the King, which half when assembled chose the remaining moiety. The distinction of the three orders, of the Clergy, the Nobility, and the third Estate, was preserved, as it used to be in the States General \*.

The towns and boroughs, and even the villages were to have their respective municipalities, all acting on the same plan, and under the direction of the Provincial Administrations, in their secondary districts.

Though at first sight this system appears extremely advantageous, yet, on examination, we shall find, that its sole tendency was to apply Republican forms, as much as circumstances would permit, to a Monarchical government; that its object was to cramp the authority of the Monarch, to clog and weaken it; and to annihilate the power of his officers, or direct agents, the intendants of provinces.

Natural effects of this system.

Soon was France by means of these assemblies and their committees, or permanent offices, to be filled with ambitious men starting forth in the new political career; men indeed who, in the first instance, would have recognized the authority of a King, but who would soon have considered themselves better informed of the wants of the people (being nearer to them) than his ministers, and

\* See D'Argenson's plans, &c. on the nature of governments.

therefore

therefore more fully acquainted with the means of alleviating their distresses. Remonstrances and philosophic reasonings would soon have followed, and sufficed to justify disobedience. The people, under a fond persuasion, that these provincial administrators supported their interests against the court, would easily have been brought to believe them the bulwark of their liberties and privileges, assigning every happy event to them, and attributing every misfortune to the King and his ministers. Each municipality coalescing with the administrators, a hundred petty Republics start into existence, ready to league against their Sovereign, who, under the title of King, would scarcely have retained the authority of a Doge.

In time we should have seen a swarm of politicians, or petty tribunes, fallying forth from these administrative bodies, who would have left no means untried to persuade the populace that such a King was rather a burden than an advantage to the state; that it would be proper to lay him aside, since he was unnecessary; that the provincial and municipal administrations would then be able to follow up in a more effectual manner, the salutary measures they had conceived for the good of the people: and thus, step by step, the Monarchical government would have been overthrown, and a municipal administration established, with the freedom of which Voltaire and D'Argenson

son had been so fascinated in Holland. The man who could not readily foresee that such would be the consequence of this municipalizing system, must have been very ignorant of the character of Frenchmen, and especially of French Philosophers when drawn into the vortex of modern politics.

Even the admission of the clergy into these provisional administrations must have proved a fatal boon to the church, as it necessarily tended to change the spirit of its ministers. Priests and bishops were admitted, or rather called upon, to form a part of these administrations, so foreign to their sacred functions, for the conspiracy had not yet attained sufficient force to cast them off. The zeal for salvation was to be superseded by the wild ambition of moving in a sphere so contrary to their calling. Already were several prelates distinguished by this new title of Administrators. Soon should we have seen them become rather the disciples of D'Argenson, Turgot and Necker, than of Christ; soon seen the bishopricks conferred upon none but Morellets and Beaudeau, with whom religion would have been a very subordinate object, when compared to the glorious enterprize of system-making, or of resisting the Ministers and the Sovereign. This was a sure method of ruining the church, by robbing her of the real bishops, and substituting petty politicians, who would easily  
be

be carried away by the torrent of impiety and ambition, and join with heart and hand a Brienne or an Expilli.

Whatever might have been the consequence to the church, it is very evident that all these new forms of administration tended directly to republicanize the state. Each of these petty administrators would soon have swelled himself into the representative of the province, and the aggregate would have styled themselves the Representatives of the Nation. The bare appellation of National Representative, combined with Modern Philosophy, sufficed to crush the Monarchy.

D'Argenson did not live to witness the experiment of his system; some may suppose that he had not foreseen its consequences. But it plainly appears, that if he even had foreseen them, so great an admirer of municipalized Republics would not have been much alarmed. At a time when the Sophisters had not sufficiently erased the love of religion from the hearts of the French to efface their affection for their Monarch, this system appeared to make but little impression; but we shall see the Sophisters afterward making it the particular object of their dissertations, to accustom the people to the idea of governing themselves\*.

\* Suppl. to Social Contract, part 3. chap. 2. by Gudin.



To the great misfortune of France, a man far more capable than D'Argenson of giving to any system the appearance of deep thought and erudition, engaged in these political speculations. The love of the commonweal may appear to have directed him toward this study ; but the real cause is to be found in the restlessness of Philosophism, and in that liberty of thinking which is disgusted with every thing around it, and which would continue restless even after having attained the object of which it was in search. This man, who by so many claims commands the public veneration was Charles Secondat, Baron de la Brede and De Montesquieu. He was born on the 18th of January 1689, in the Chateau de la Brede, within three leagues of Bourdeaux ; and in 1716, became president à mortier of that parliament. We have already mentioned, that his first productions were those of a young man who had no fixed principles of religion ; and this is clearly perceptible in perusing the *Lettres Persannes*. At a riper age his duty called him to the study of the laws ; but not content with the knowledge of those of his own country, and desirous of making himself conversant in those of foreign nations, he made the tour of Europe, stayed sometime in England, and then returned to France full of those ideas which he has developed in the two works that have chiefly contributed to his fame. The first is entitled, *Confi-*

Montesquieu.

VOL. II.

E

derations

*derations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decline of the Roman Empire*, and was published in 1733; the latter was, *The Spirit of Laws*, which appeared in 1748.

Montesquieu's first attacks on the Throne.

It was obvious, on the first appearance of his work on the Romans, that Montesquieu had not acquired from his travels an additional esteem for the government of his own country. One of the prime causes to which he attributes the eclat of the Romans, is their love of a Liberty which begins by dethroning all Kings. The Sophisters, who were still less favorable to Monarchy, did not fail to adopt this idea, to make it the leading principle, and to inculcate it in all their discourses \*.

Both Montesquieu and his panegyrists would have been more correct, had they traced back to this love of liberty all those scourges and intestine broils which harrassed Rome, from the expulsion of its Kings until the reign of the Emperors. Liberty perpetually convulsed the people, and the senate could only free themselves from their clamours by habitual war and foreign pillage. This perpetual state of hostility rendered the Roman the most warlike of all nations, and gave them that immense advantage which they enjoyed over all other people. To the man who has read the Roman history, nothing can be more evident.

\* Eloge de Montesquieu by D'Alembert.

But

But if such be the merits of that liberty which expelled the Kings from Rome, that antisocial spirit, which, sowing discord in the interior œconomy of families, drives them from their homes, inures them to fatigue and the inclemency of the weather, and gives them all the advantages and strength of robbers, by forcing them to live on plunder, after having denied them the sweets of social life,—the Antisocial spirit, I say, must needs possess the very same advantages.

Montesquieu was so strangely misled by his admiration for liberty, that he did not perceive the strangely paradoxical positions that he advanced. His Paradoxes on the Kings of Rome. After having spoken of the public edifices, *which even to this day give us a great idea of the power and grandeur of Rome under its Kings*, after having said, “that one of the causes of its prosperity was, that its Kings were all great men, and that no country could ever shew *such a continued series of statesmen and great generals* ;” he adds, nearly in the same page, “that on the expulsion of the Kings it must necessarily follow, either that Rome would change its government, or remain a poor and petty monarchy \*.” In a word, that if Rome arrived at that very high pitch of greatness, it was owing to its having *substituted annual Consuls* to the dethroned Kings.

\* Considerations, &c. &c. on the Romans.

This work teems with satirical remarks on Rome, when again brought under the dominion of a Monarch; and his frequent expressions of regret for the loss of the Republican Liberty, could not but tend to diminish that love, that admiration, that enthusiasm so natural to Frenchmen for their King. One might really suspect that he wished to instil into the minds of the people a belief, that what Sovereigns call establishing order, is another term for riveting fetters on their subjects\*.

His Spirit  
of Laws.

But the work that we have been considering was merely a prelude to the doctrines which he was about to teach (*in his Spirit of Laws*) to all nations governed by a Monarch. Let us premise, and with great sincerity we say it, that had we to perform the task of a panegyrist, causes for admiration would abound; had we to answer those critics who reproach Montesquieu with having taken the motto, *prolem sine matre creatam*, and giving his work as if it were an original, though he may appear to have followed the footsteps of Bodin, celebrated for his work on Republics, we nevertheless think we may triumphantly answer, that the dross he may have borrowed from others cannot alloy the sterling value of his own production; and that in spite of the errors contained in the

\* Chap. 13.

Spirit

Spirit of Laws, it will for ever continue to be considered as the work of a wonderful genius \*.

But it is not for us to assume the character, either of the critic or of the panegyrist. Our object is to investigate how far Montesquieu broached or influenced revolutionary ideas. It is the misfortune of a great genius, that his very errors are too often converted into oracles. Truth must often submit to error, when that error is supported by a celebrated name! That victory which he would have disclaimed, resulted merely from the

\* We may safely assert, that if Montesquieu has borrowed such dross as the System of Climates from Bodin, he has thrown aside many articles which by no means coincided with his ideas: For example, the definition of a Sovereign given by Bodin could never agree with Montesquieu's notions of a free people, or of its representatives. The former is exaggerated. In Bodin's language, we might say, that the covenant by which the Sovereign is constituted, gives him the right of disposing at pleasure of the lives and fortunes of every citizen: That the sole distinction between the Tyrant and the lawful King is, that the former exercises his authority for the subjugation, while the latter exerts his for the happiness of the people. The generality of Montesquieu's principles appear not to recognize a sufficient Sovereignty in the real Monarch; but the opposite excess into which Bodin had fallen may, by disgusting Montesquieu, have driven him into the opposite extreme. In short, whether this criticism be correct or not is of little consequence, our object being to represent Montesquieu's ideas exactly as he has expressed them, in whatever part of the work they may be found.

celebrity of his name, and the weight of his authority. The distinction which he makes between the principles of Monarchy and those of Republicanism may convince the reader. In an ordinary writer, the whole of that part of the Spirit of Laws would have been looked upon as the sport of imagination playing upon words. But from Montesquieu they are received as the result of profound thought, sanctioned by the great name of history. Let us examine whether the notions branding Monarchy with disgrace can originate from any thing but the abuse of terms.

His distinction between the principles of Monarchies and of Republics.

Honour, in the general acceptance of his countrymen, was the fear of being despised, and a horror particularly of being looked upon as a coward. It was the sentiment of Glory and of Courage. When a more moral sentiment attached itself to *honour*, it was converted into the shame of having done, or of hearing oneself reproached as having done, some act unworthy of an honest man; for instance, as having broken one's word. Montesquieu, observing the despotic influence which this word exercised over his countrymen, adopted *honour* as the first principle, the main spring, the prime mover of Monarchies, and flatters Republics with having virtue for their first principle\*. The chivalry of the French, pleased

\* Spirit of the Laws, Book III. Chap. 3. and following.

with

with the idea, applauds Montesquieu, but does not perceive that in adopting the word he falsifies the sentiment and metamorphoses it into *a false honour, a prejudice, a thirst of fame, an ambition for distinctions or for favor*; in a word, into all the vices of the courtier\*. This was bewildering *honour*; it was telling those bold Knights, so zealous for their King, that they were no more than effeminate courtiers, ambitious men, and slaves to a prejudice the source of all the vices of Courts: an assertion the more evidently false, as many a Frenchman replete with true honour was entirely free from any of those vices. Such a distinction was not only odious and disgraceful, it was also delusive, and the delusion seems to have prevented Montesquieu from perceiving that hereafter Philosophism would adopt the principle, but would only repeat the word *honour* as the opposite to *virtue, the principle of Republics*, and brand the Royalists with all the false prejudices, the ambition, and other vices, which he had artfully ascribed to *honour*.

This first error therefore was the offspring of delusion. Though, in one sense, as much may be said of the pretended principle of Democracies. In another point of view, however, this principle may be introduced with more correctness; and

\* Ib. Chap. 7, & *passim*, Book III. and V.

this latter sense appears to be that to which Montesquieu at first alluded. It is undeniable, that virtue ought to be more particularly the principle of Democracies than of any other form of Government, they being the most turbulent and the most vicious of all ; in which virtue is absolutely necessary to control the passions of men, to quell that spirit of cabal, anarchy, and faction inherent to the Democratic form, and to chain down that ambition and rage of dominion over the people, which the weakness of the laws can scarcely withstand.

But it would have been satyric in the extreme to have adopted this latter sense ; and Montesquieu's great admiration for the ancient Democracies would never permit him to give such an explanation of the principle. He therefore generalizes or particularizes his definitions as suits his purpose. At one time *this virtue*, the prime mover of Republics, is *the love of one's country—that is to say, of Equality—is a political, and not a moral virtue*\*. At another, *this political is a moral virtue*, as it is directed to the public good †. In one place it is not *the virtue of individuals* ‡, though in another it is every thing that can be understood *by good morals*, or by the virtue of a people *who are pre-*

\* Advertisement of the Author to the new Edition.

† Note to chap. 5, Book III.      ‡ Ibid.

*Served*



*saved from corruption by the goodness of their maxims* \*. Again, it is the most common virtue in that state where “ theft is blended with the “ spirit of justice ; the hardest servitude with ex- “ cels of Liberty, the most atrocious sentiments “ with the greatest moderation ;” in short, it is the virtue of that state where “ natural senti- “ ments are preserved without the tie of son, “ husband, or father, and where even chastity “ is denuded of modesty and shame †.”

Whatever idea the reader may have formed of virtue through the mist which appears to have enveloped the genius of Montesquieu in enigmatic darkness, let us ask, which principle will he adopt, or which will he conceive to be the most clearly expressed ? If asked, whether virtue was not also to be found in Monarchies, he will answer, “ I know that virtuous Princes are no “ uncommon sight ; but I venture to affirm, *that in* “ *a Monarchy* it is extremely difficult for the peo- “ ple to be virtuous ‡ ;” and this sentiment, so odious and so injurious to all Royalists, will in the end be the most clearly deduced of all the new opinions he has broached upon Monarchical Government. Whether such were his intentions or not, a day will come, when the Sophisters, re-

\* Chap. 2, Book I.      † Chap. 6, Book IV.

‡ Chap. 5, Book III.

peating

peating his assertions, will say to the people,  
 “ You only love your King because you have not  
 “ a sufficient sense of Philosophy to raise your-  
 “ selves above *the prejudices of ambition and of false*  
 “ *honour* ; because you are destitute of those *moral*  
 “ *virtues which direct to the public good* ; because  
 “ you are not inflamed with *the love of your Coun-*  
 “ *try* ; because you admire that form of Govern-  
 “ ment, where it is *extremely difficult for the people to*  
 “ *be virtuous*. You would admire *Democracy* were  
 “ your *morals good*, and were you fired with the  
 “ *amor patriæ*—but, destitute of virtue and unac-  
 “ quainted with Philosophy, you are only capable  
 “ of loving your Kings.”

Such, as every reflecting reader must perceive, is the real explanation of these principles. The Revolution has only brought them into practice. We have heard a Robespierre and a Sieyès, proclaiming to the people, that in crushing the Scepter, murdering their King, and constituting France a Republic, they had *only put virtue on the order of the day*. In the midst of massacres and bloodshed, they profaned the sacred name of virtue ; and with virtue in their mouths they plunged the people into the most horrid scenes of vice and debauchery. But have we not seen Montesquieu teaching them how to blend virtue with the *most atrocious sentiments*, and how it may reign amidst the *hardest servitude, or the excess of Liberty* ? Attributing such  
 inten-

intentions to this celebrated writer would most certainly be doing injustice to his memory; but still it is our duty to speak unreservedly on what he has written, and to shew what sentiments nations may have imbibed from his writings. It is awful to reflect (whatever may have been his intentions) on the terrible ravages which his opinions, supported by the authority of his name, have operated in the minds of men. Error is in its infancy with Montesquieu; but it is the same error that was afterwards, in the state of manhood, adopted by Robespierre. Montesquieu would have shrunk back with horror had he heard that Democratic villain place virtue *for the order of the day* with his sanguinary Republic; but what could the astonished master have replied, on being told, *that it was extremely difficult for the people to be virtuous under a Monarch*, or under Lewis XVI.?

Let genius shrink back with horror at seeing its errors traverse the immense interval between Montesquieu and Robespierre; let it tremble at its despotic influence over the public opinion. Without designing any convulsion, by its very name it may ~~raise~~ raise the most dreadful storm. At first, its errors may be tender shoots; but, daily gaining bulk and strength, will not at length a Condorcet, a Petion, or a Sieyès, wield the massive limb?

During a long period Montesquieu's opinions on the principles of Monarchies and Republics were

were entirely overlooked, and they might have remained in oblivion at any other time, when Philosophism was less active in its research after every means of rendering the Throne odious.—Almost as much may be said of that *Equality* which, he believed, “ in Democracy limited ambition to the sole desire of doing greater services to our country, than the rest of our fellow-citizens \* :” a virtue far too sublime for Monarchies, “ where nobody aims at Equality ; it does not so much as enter their thoughts ; they all aspire to superiority. People of the very lowest condition desire to emerge from their obscurity only to lord it over their fellow-subjects † .” Genius may have been so led away, as not to perceive how powerful a weapon it was forging for the Jacobin, who, extolling the merits of this Equality, and persuading the people that it was impracticable under the dominion of the Monarch, would also paint in glowing colours *that ambition of serving the country*, arising from the ashes of the Throne and the destruction of the Nobility. But there appeared another system in the *Spirit of Laws*, deeper laid, and replete with weapons more directly pointed at the Throne. They were the first on which Philosophism seized, while others adopted them through ignorance, from

\* Chap. 3, Book V.

† Chap. 4, Book V.

want of reflection, or from imprudence. They were too fatal in the hands of the first rebels not to claim a place in these Memoirs.

To form a correct idea of the Revolutionary tendency of Montesquieu's system, we must revert to the time at which it was published. Whatever may have been the Legislative forms in the primitive days of the French Monarchy, it is certain that at the time of his publication (and he avows it) not only the King of France, but most of the crowned heads united in their persons the rights of executing the laws, of enacting those which they conceived necessary or conducive to the welfare of the State, and of judging those who had infringed the law \*.

State of the French Monarchy, when his system on the distinction of Powers appeared.

The reunion of this Triple Power constitutes an *absolute Monarch*; that is to say, a real Sovereign who in his person concentrates the whole power of the law. At that period the French were far from confounding this absolute power with the arbitrary power of the Tyrant or the Despot. This power was to be found in Republics and in mixt States. Here it existed in the Senate, or in the assembly of Deputies; there in the compound of the Senate and the King. The French nation beheld it in their Monarch, whose supreme will, legally proclaimed, was the utmost degree of political authority.

• Chap. 6, Book XI.

This

Difference between an absolute and an arbitrary power.

This supreme will, construed into law by the requisite forms, was equally binding on the King and on his subjects. It is not only Henry IV. and his Minister Sully, who declare *that the first law of the Sovereign is to observe them all*; but it is Lewis XIV. that Prince whom the Sophisters affectedly style the Despot, who at the height of his glory openly proclaims this obligation in his edicts: "Do not let it be said," are his words, "that the Sovereign shall not be subject to the laws of the state. The rights of nations proclaim the contrary truth, which has sometimes been attacked by flattery, but which all good Princes have defended as the guardian of their states. How much more accurate it is to say, that to constitute the perfect happiness of a kingdom, it is necessary that the Prince should be obeyed by his subjects, *that the Prince should obey the Laws*, and that those laws should be just and directed to the public good \*!"

This obligation alone in the Sovereign immediately destroys all despotic or arbitrary power.—For, in the idiom of modern languages, the Despot is the man who rules only by his passions and caprice; under whom no subject can be at ease, as he is ignorant whether his master will not punish

\* Edict of Lewis XIV. 1667; also the *Treatise of the Queen's Rights on Spain*.

him

him to-day for having executed the orders he had received from him yesterday.

In short, it may be justly said, that Political Liberty consists in two points: 1st, That every Citizen should be free to do all that is not forbidden by the law: 2dly, That the law should prescribe or forbid any particular action for the public good only. Experience will vouch for the correctness of this definition. And where could the honest and upright man, obedient to the laws of his country, enjoy greater security and freedom than he did in France?

It may indeed, be objected, that there existed many abuses, but did they not originate from the genius of the French, or from an excess rather than a want of liberty? Were the conspirators to exclaim against the immoral and impious Minister for having abused the power with which he was entrusted, when these Sophisters had during many years conspired against the morals and piety of the whole nation? No; they had no right to complain that the law was often sacrificed to private passions; the exact observance of the law should have been their prayer, but they only sought after ruin and revolution.

One real abuse had crept into the French Government, which favoured much of Despotism.—*Of Lettres de Cachet, and of their abuse.* This was the use of *Lettres de Cachet*. Undoubtedly they were illegal. On a bare order from the King

King the subject lost his liberty. I will not defend such an abuse by saying, that none but the higher classes or seditious writers were exposed to the effect of this arbitrary power. But, perhaps, few are acquainted with the origin of those Letters. It was to the moral character of the French, and to the notions particularly of the higher classes, that this abuse owed its origin ; and it was necessary either to do away those notions, or to leave so formidable a power in the hands of the Monarch.

Such was the received opinion in France, that a family would have thought itself dishonored, if any child, brother, or near relation were brought to justice. Hence it was that families, fearing the arm of the law, applied to the King to obtain an order to imprison any profligate youth whose irregular conduct might disgrace the family. If any hopes of reformation could be conceived, the *Lettre de Cachet* was only temporary, and served as a correction ; but where the offence was criminal and infamous, the culprit was imprisoned for life.

The reader must not be misled to suppose, that these Letters were granted on a mere request and without any inquiry into the case. After Mr. de Malesherbe's administration, the Petitions sent to the King were transmitted to the Intendant of the Province, who immediately ordered his sub-delegate to call a meeting of the relations and witnesses, and to take minutes of their  
pro-



proceedings. On these informations, which were forwarded to the Ministers, his Majesty granted or refused the *Lettre de Cachet* \*.

Under such restrictions it was evidently rather the authority of a common parent, which the King exercised over his subjects, than that of a despot enslaving them. With the notions which the French nation had adopted, it was the necessary means of preserving the honour of different families; and few were victims to this authority but those who were dangerous either to private or public society. From the use to the abuse of a thing, however, the distance is but small: a profligate minister might exercise this power against the ci-

\* Although these *Lettres de Cachet* did not generally regard the commonalty, yet the king, when petitioned, did not always refuse them to the lower classes. I was once ordered to attend one of those meetings as interpreter for an honest German, who, though low in life, had requested his Majesty to grant a *Lettre de Cachet* for his wife, who, violent and choleric, had attempted to stab him, but fortunately he had stopped her hand. The poor man, unable to live in peace or safety with this woman, and unwilling to bring her before a tribunal, had recourse to the King, who ordered the Intendant to take all the proper evidence. The relations and witnesses were secretly assembled. I saw the Subdelegate examine the facts with the greatest humanity. The whole being verified, the minutes were laid before his Majesty, and the *Lettre de Cachet* granted. The lady was confined; but in a few months she was permitted to return, and was ever after a model of gentleness and submission.

tizen or the magistrate who had fulfilled his duty with the greatest integrity. Nor was it unexampled, that a minister, solicited by powerful men, rather consulted their private animosities, than public justice, or general utility. But a profligate minister abusing his authority does not make his King a despot. The morals of the higher classes being perverted, as we have seen, by Philosophism, the abuse of this prerogative might loudly call for reform; but are the Sophisters thence justifiable in seeking to overthrow the Monarchy?

The French attached to their King, at the time the *Spirit of Laws* was published.

In short, whatever may have been the cause of these abuses at the period when *the Spirit of Laws* appeared, it had never entered the minds of Frenchmen, that they lived under a despotic government. Let us hear Jean Jaques Rousseau lay down the law, he who created systems to overthrow it; and let the candid reader judge how far the Sophisters are authorized to represent the French government as arbitrary, oppressive, and tyrannical. “What, (says Jean Jaques), is the true end of a political association? Is it not the preservation and prosperity of its members? And what is the most certain sign that they are preserved, and that they prosper? Is it not the increasing population? We need seek no further for the sign in dispute; but pronounce that government to be infallibly the best (provided there is no particular circumstance to make it stand an exception to a general rule) under which,

“ which, without the application of any improper  
 “ means, without the naturalization of strangers,  
 “ without receiving any new colonists, the citizens  
 “ increase and multiply : and that to be the worst  
 “ under which they lessen and decay. Calcula-  
 “ tors, it is now your affair ; count, measure and  
 “ compare them \*.” The same author adds, “ It  
 “ is a long continuance in the same situation that  
 “ makes prosperity or calamity real. When a  
 “ whole nation lies crushed under the foot of  
 “ despotism, it is then that the people perish ;  
 “ and it is then that their masters can hurl de-  
 “ struction among them with impunity, *ubi solitu-*  
 “ *dinem faciunt, pacem appellant* (and call peace,  
 “ the silence of the desert they have created).  
 “ When the factions of the chief men of France  
 “ had arisen to such a height as to agitate the  
 “ kingdom, and the coadjutor of Paris judged it  
 “ necessary to carry a dagger in his pocket every  
 “ time he went into the parliament, the French  
 “ people lived free and at ease, they were happy  
 “ and their numbers increased. The prosperity  
 “ of a nation and its population depends much  
 “ more *on liberty* than on peace †”.

Thus, without taking on himself the task of  
 calculator, Jean Jaques confesses that the French  
 people, even in the midst of civil broils, *lived free*

\* Social Contract, Chap. 9, Book III. † Ib. in the note.

*and at ease.* But let us attend to one of his most faithful disciples, who undertook to calculate, and that at a time when the revolution had done away every idea of exaggerating the happiness of the French people under the government of their Kings. The revolutionist Gudin, in his annotations on the above text, and in his Supplement to the Social Contract, has examined and calculated, year by year, the state of the population, the deaths, births, and marriages of all the principal towns in the kingdom during the course of this century, and then proceeds: "The author of the  
 " Social Contract spoke a grand truth when he  
 " exclaimed: Calculators, it is now your affair;  
 " *count, measure and compare.* His advice has  
 " been followed; we have calculated, measured,  
 " and compared, and the result of all these calculations has demonstrated that the population of  
 " France is really twenty-four millions, though it  
 " had always been supposed to be under twenty;  
 " that the annual births amount to one million;  
 " and *that the population is daily increasing.*

. " Hence we may conclude, after Rousseau, that  
 " the government was very good. It really was  
 " better than it ever had been at any period since  
 " the destruction of that which the Romans had  
 " established in Gaul." Such are the words of the same author, and according to his calculations it was *in the reign of Lewis XIV*, whom the Sophists

sters represent as the haughtiest of despots, *that the population of France began to increase regularly and universally throughout the whole kingdom, notwithstanding all his wars.*

“ The long reign of Lewis XV. (another alleged despot, under whose reign the Antimonarchical Conspiracy was begun and indefatigably conducted) was not exposed to such calamities ; and it is certain, continues the revolutionist Gudin, that during the whole monarchy, there has existed no period when population increased in a more constant and uniform progression throughout the whole kingdom, than during that reign. It increased to that amazing height, that from twenty-four to twenty-five millions of souls were spread over a surface of twenty-five thousand square leagues, which makes about a million of souls to a thousand square leagues, or a thousand inhabitants to every square league, *a population so unparalleled in Europe, that it might be almost looked upon as a prodigy.*”

Let us hear the same author on the state of France at the time when the Revolution broke out, which he is perpetually extolling ; and let us remark, that the work whence we have extracted our documents was so acceptable to the Revolutionary Assembly, that by a particular decree of the 13th of November 1790, *it accepted the homage of it* : a stronger contrast cannot be sketched be-

tween that Revolution and its authors, whether distant or immediate, and the necessity of those plans by which they pretended to work the happiness of the Empire. The same author continues:

“ The French territory is so well cultivated,  
 “ that its annual produce is estimated at four thousand millions.

“ Its currency amounted to two thousand two hundred millions, and the gold and silver employed in plate and jewels may be estimated at a similar amount.

“ The Records of the Assinage Office in Paris attest, that the annual consumption or rather waste of refined gold, in gilding furniture, carriages, pasteboard, china, nails, fans, buttons, books, in spotting stuffs, or in plating silver, amounted to the enormous sum of eight hundred thousand livres.

“ The profit on trade was annually computed at between forty and fifty millions.

“ The taxes paid by the people did not exceed six hundred and ten or twelve millions, which does not amount to one third of the circulating medium, nor to one sixth part of the gross territorial produce, and which probably cannot be computed at more than one third of the neat produce, a sum which in that proportion  
 “ could

“ could not have been exorbitant if every one had  
 “ paid according to his means \*.

“ In this kingdom were annually born upwards  
 “ of 928,000 children; in short, nearly a million.  
 “ The town of Paris contained 666,000 inhabit-  
 “ ants. Its riches were so great, that it paid an-  
 “ nually one hundred millions into the King’s

\* As this last sentence alludes to the privileges and exemp-  
 tions of the Clergy and Nobility, I cannot but refer my rea-  
 der to a work attributed to Mr. Senac de Meilhan, and which  
 is very satisfactory on this point. It contains the following  
 passage: “ Mr. Necker at length, in a moment of pique  
 “ against his ungrateful children, disclosed the whole truth,  
 “ and declared before the National Assembly, that the ex-  
 “ emptions of the Clergy and Nobility, which had been re-  
 “ presented in so odious a light, did not exceed seven millions  
 “ of livres (318,181l.) that the half of that sum belonged to  
 “ the privileged persons of the *Tiers Etat*—and that the tax  
 “ on enregistering, (*droit de contrôle*) which only bore on  
 “ the two first orders, amply balanced the privileges they  
 “ enjoyed with regard to the ordinary taxes. These me-  
 “ morable words were spoken in the face of all Europe, but  
 “ were drowned in the cries of the victorious demagogues.  
 “ The Clergy, the Nobility, and the Monarchy, all have  
 “ perished,”—and perished under the pretence of an inequa-  
 lity of privileges (an empty assertion), which was more than  
 amply compensated by a single tax on the privileged orders.  
 This was the tax on all public acts. It was rated in propor-  
 tion to the sum specified in the act, or to the *titles inserted*.  
 “ Thus the Most High and Puissant Lord, Marquis, Count  
 “ or Baron, was rated according to his birth, or rank, while  
 “ a citizen only paid in the ratio of his obscurity.” *Vid. this*  
*work, and note to chap. 6.*

F 4

“ coffers,

“coffers, about one sixth of the whole taxation of France.

“But even this immense taxation did not overburthen Paris. Its inhabitants lived in affluence. If its daily consumption amounted to one million, at least from eighty to one hundred millions were necessary for its interior circulation.

“In short, calculators have estimated, that during the reign of Lewis XV. *the population of the country was increased by one ninth*, that is to say, by two millions five or six hundred thousand souls.

“Such was the state of France and of Paris at the time the revolution took place; and as no other state in Europe could exhibit such a population, nor boast of such revenues, it was not without reason that *it passed for the first kingdom on the Continent.*”

Supplement to the Social Contract. See note Population.

The revolutionist Gudin, to whom we are indebted for all these particulars, concludes by saying, “I thought it necessary to state in a precise and exact manner the population and riches of the kingdom at the period when *so grand a revolution took place*. I apprehended that this investigation would shew the future progress of the nation, and serve as a table by which we might calculate the advantages that will accrue from the constitution when brought to perfection.”



"tion." Without doubt our author has by this time formed his opinion on the advantages of that constitution; but we can plainly see by his enthusiastic admiration of the revolution, and of the Philosophers to whom he attributes the honor of having effected it\*, that he was very far from wishing to exaggerate the liberty and happiness of France under the Monarchy. By the foregoing long extract we have no other object in view, than that of furnishing the historian with the proper materials (all extracted from the greatest admirers or chief authors of the French Revolution) to enable him to judge of those systems in which the Revolution originated, and to appreciate properly the wisdom or the imprudence of its authors.—But to return to Montesquieu.

Precisely at that period when *L'Esprit des Loix* was published, the French were so happy and so pleased with their King, that the surname of *well-beloved* (*bien aimé*) had resounded from one extremity of the nation to the other. And, unfortunately for Montesquieu, it is from this publication that we are to trace all those Philosophical reveries on Liberty and Equality, which at first only produced disquiet and doubt, but which soon after created other systems, that misled the French people in their ideas on government, that weakened the

\* Book III. Chap. on the Philosophers.

tie of affection between the subject and the monarch, and generated at length the monster of Revolutions.

There is an essential difference to be perceived between Voltaire and Montesquieu. Voltaire, as we have shown, would willingly have endured a Monarch that should have connived at his impiety. He would have thought himself sufficiently free, had he been allowed publicly to blaspheme ; and, generally speaking, he was more partial to the forms of Monarchy, or of Aristocracy, than to those of Democracy. It was his hatred to religion (and he hated religion more than he loved Kings) which plunged him into the municipalizing system.

His admiration for foreign laws. His systems inapplicable to his country.

With Montesquieu it was far otherwise. Though he was not indifferent on the subject of religious liberty, it was nevertheless Monarchy itself that he meant to investigate. He proposed to regulate all kingly power and authority according to his ideas of political liberty. Had religious liberty been carried to excess, still he would have looked upon himself as immersed in slavery in every state where the public authority was not subdivided, according to his system, into three distinct powers, *the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judiciary*. This distinction was new to the French nation, which had been accustomed to view its Monarch as the central point of all political authority.

thority. The peaceful ages they had passed under their Legislative Kings little inclined them to envy the boisterous liberty of a neighbouring country, perhaps more celebrated for its civil broils in quest of liberty, than for the wisdom of its constitution, which, at length fixing every mind and every heart, had scarcely terminated a long struggle between the Monarch and the People.

Without doubt we may admire, as much as Montesquieu, the wisdom of that nation which has known how to model its laws according to the experience it had acquired during those struggles. Laws, indeed, congenial to the manners which characterize it, to its local situation, and even to its prejudices. But is that constitution, the most perfect perhaps existing for a nation surrounded by the ocean, to be equally perfect when transplanted into a continental state? Has not nature, by diversifying the soil, varied its culture? Are men, so heterogeneous in their characters, men that may be viewed under so many different points, are they, in order to attain happiness and freedom, to be reduced to one only mode of government? No; it would have been madness to adopt the English constitution in France. The genius of the French nation must have been totally changed before a Frenchman would believe himself free where the Englishman does not even perceive the yoke of the law; before the former would refrain from  
abusing

abusing that liberty which the latter will scarcely taste of; and particularly before the Frenchman could be kept within those limits where the Englishman rests content.

We are willing to believe, that Montesquieu had never made these reflections, when, carried away by his admiration for foreign laws, he was inventing new principles, and presenting as constant and general such truths, as would make his countrymen view their Sovereign in the light of a real Despot, and the mild government they lived under, though so conformable to their interests and their genius, as that of a most horrid and shameful slavery.

His  
systems  
alienate  
the  
French  
from  
their  
King.

It is painful to apply such a reproach to this celebrated writer; but can history refrain from observing the fatal impression which such doctrines must have made on a people so long accustomed to say, *si veut le Roi, si veut la loi*, (as the King wills, so wills the law); the doctrines, I say, of him who dared assert as a demonstrated truth, that “when the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise lest the same Monarch or Senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner\*.” But

• Chap. 6. Book XI.

in

in laying down this principle he had taken care to say immediately before, " the political liberty of  
 " the subject is a tranquillity of mind, arising  
 " from the opinion which each one has of his  
 " safety. In order to have this liberty, it is requisite that the Government be so constituted,  
 " as that one man need not be afraid of another\*."

Either Montesquieu must have believed the French reader incapable of uniting these two ideas, or else he meant to say, " Frenchmen! You believe that under the government of your King you are in safety, and enjoy liberty. Your opinion is erroneous, it is shameful. Amidst that calm which you seem to enjoy *there is no liberty*; and none can exist so long as you repeat *si veut le Roi, si veut la loi*; in short, so long as the Legislative and Executive Powers are united in the person of your King. He must be deprived either of the one or the other; or else you must submit to live in the perpetual terror of *tyrannical laws, tyrannically executed*."

This language is not held out to the French alone, but to every people governed by Kings, even to most Republics, where, as he himself remarks, these powers were often united. The whole universe was then in a state of slavery, and

• Chap. 6, Book XI.

Mon-

Montesquieu was the apostle sent to teach them to break their chains, chains so light that few were even sensible of their existence! A general Revolution was then necessary, that mankind might assert its liberty! I could wish to exculpate Montesquieu; but if on the one side I am afraid of attributing intentions to him which he never had, on the other I dare not revile genius by separating it from reason; by saying that he had laid down new principles without even perceiving their most immediate consequences. It is a hard task to represent Montesquieu brandishing the torch of discord between nations and their Kings, between the subjects even of Republics and their Senates, or their Magistrates; but would it not be something more or less than kindness, to behold the torch, and the man who wields it, without daring to intimate the intention of kindling a blaze? How chimerical must have been that terror of tyrannical laws tyrannically executed, in a country where the legislator himself is bound by pre-existing laws, whose sole object is the preservation of property, liberty, and the safety of the subject!—What a phantom such a supposition must be in a country where the King was omnipotent in the love of his subjects, and null in tyranny; in a country where, if the representations of the Magistrates were insufficient, the Monarch could never resist those of the people, whose very silence was suffi-

sufficient to disarm him, and he would abrogate any number of laws to make them return to their noisy acclamations. Montesquieu, who attributes so much influence to climates, might very well have taken into consideration the manners, the character, and the received opinions, acting so much more powerfully among his countrymen than in any other nation. But the fact was, that the French laws enacted by their Legislative Monarchs were not to be surpassed either in wisdom or mildness by the laws of any country; under those Legislative Kings they had seen their liberties, so far from being contracted, ascertained and extended, and facts are better authorities than systems\*.

The same error, the same delusion shows itself when Montesquieu believes every thing to be ruined, if the Prince who has enacted a law has the power of judging the man who transgresses it. Such a fear might be reasonable in a country

His errors  
on the Ju-  
diary  
Power.

\* On this occasion we may cite Mr. Garat, a lawyer, whose opinion cannot be mistrusted, having with many other of his brethren distinguished himself by his philosophical zeal for the Revolution; and before that period he was one of the most obstinate sticklers for the sovereignty of the people.—Nevertheless he says, “at present all laws emanate from the “supreme will of the Monarch, who no longer has the whole “nation for his council. But his throne is so easy of access, “that the wishes of the nation can always reach it.”  
*Garat's Report: de jurispru. art SOUVERAIN.*

where

where the Legislative Monarch could be both judge and plaintiff, thus sitting in judgment on his own cause, and over those of his subjects of whom he might have reason to complain; or where the Legislative King becomes sole Magistrate and sole Judge, or violates the accustomed forms requiring a certain number of Magistrates and votes to condemn or absolve a subject. This was a chimerical terror in every true Monarchy, where, as in France, the first law is to observe those of nature, which will always preclude either Sovereign or Magistrate from sitting in judgment on their own causes, and on their private differences with the subject. A terror still more futile wherever, as in France, the King might be cast in his own tribunals, and where equally with any subject he was bound by the law. Hence nothing could ever have made the French unite the idea of Despotism to that of a Monarch the judge of his subjects. With what romantic ideas and tender affection they were wont to paint those happy days when Lewis IX. surrounded by his subjects as if they had been his children, would, under a shady oak, hear and determine their differences, with all the authority and justice of the first magistrate of his kingdom \* ! How new must it then have been for the people to hear Montesquieu assert, that “ there

\* See Joinville's Memoirs.



" is no liberty, if the power of judging be not  
 " separated from the Legislative and Executive  
 " Powers! Were it joined with the Legislative,  
 " the life and liberty of the subject would be ex-  
 " posed to *arbitrary control*, for the Judge would  
 " then be the Legislator. Were it joined to the  
 " Executive Power, the Judge might behave with  
 " all the violence of an oppressor. There would  
 " be an end of every thing, were the same man,  
 " or the same body, whether of the Nobles or of  
 " the people, to exercise those three powers, that  
 " of enacting laws, that of executing the public  
 " resolutions, and that of judging the crimes, or  
 " determining the disputes of individuals \*."

Montesquieu appears to have felt the danger of  
 such lessons, when he really seeks to console na-  
 tions by telling them, that " most kingdoms in  
 " Europe enjoy a moderate government, because  
 " the Prince who is invested with the first two  
 " powers leaves the third to his subjects." But  
 such a distinction can little avail; of what conse-  
 quence can it be, that the Prince should leave this  
 third power to his subjects, when about twenty  
 lines higher Montesquieu has laid down as a con-  
 stant principle, that when the two first powers are  
 united in the same person *there can be no Liberty?*  
 And why does he immediately add, " In Turkey,

• Chap. 6, Book XI.

VOL. II.

G

" where

“ where these three powers are united in the Sul-  
 “ tan’s person, the subjects groan under the weight  
 “ of the most frightful oppression \* ? Is it not  
 very well known, that the Sultan generally leaves  
 the judiciary power to the tribunals ? Could the  
 illustrious author have meant to address his coun-  
 trymen in saying, “ You who in every age of  
 “ your history behold your Kings exercising this  
 “ power, such as Hugues Capet judging Arnould  
 “ de Rheims ; as Lewis the Younger, the Bishop  
 “ of Langres, and the Duke of Burgundy ; as  
 “ Lewis IX. administering justice to all those of  
 “ his subjects who had recourse to him ; as  
 “ Charles V. judging the Marquis of Saluces, or  
 “ Charles VII. condemning the Duke of Alen-  
 “ çon ; as Francis I. pronouncing on the Conne-  
 “ table de Bourbon, and Lewis XIII. judging the  
 “ Duke de la Valette ; in fine, all you, I say, who  
 “ behold your Monarchs exercising the judiciary  
 “ power, learn that there was *an end of every thing*  
 “ under such Princes, who were real Sultans, by  
 “ whom the subject was made to groan under the  
 “ most *frightful despotism*, and that you are in dan-  
 “ ger of seeing it revived every time your Kings  
 “ shall exercise the same powers †.”

Would

\* Chap. 6, Book XI.

† It might be objected, that some of the Kings, as in the  
 case of Francis I. who sat in judgment on trials for High Treason  
 were judges in their own cause. But in reality those are  
 causes

Would it not have been wiser and more correct if Montesquieu had said, that what constituted the despotic power in the Sultan was the power of capriciously and instantaneously pronouncing on all points, following no other guide but his passion and his momentary interest? He sends the bowstring and it is an order to die; but can such an order be deemed a judgment. He sends it because he wills it, little regarding the letter or decisions of the law; and it little imports whether such a will be assented to by a senate which may bear the title of judges, or whether he wills it alone, and in direct opposition to such a body of Magistrates. Such is the power which creates a Sultan, and which constitutes Despotism. But is it not chimerical to suppose, that in France the power of making a law and then pronouncing according to the decisions of that law antecedently made and promulgated, could constitute Despotism?

causes which interest the whole state. It might as well be objected, that a French Parliament could not judge a traitor to the state, because it is the cause of every Frenchman. This was an objection made against Francis I. in the case of the Marquis de Saluces. It was quashed by the Attorney General. But its having been made is sufficient to prove that the King was no despot, since the laws of the country, and a court of justice were to decide, whether he could exercise his power in that particular case.—(*Repert: de Jurisprud. art. Roy, par M. Polverel.*)

This erroneous assertion of so celebrated a writer is the more extraordinary, as we find it fully refuted in that part of his work where he treats of those ancient Dukes and Counts who, under the ancient government of the Franks, exercised, the three powers. " It may be imagined perhaps, " (he says) that the government of the Franks " must have been very severe at that time, since " the same officers were invested with a military " and a civil power, nay, even with a fiscal " power over the subjects, which in the pre- " ceding books I have observed to be distin- " guishing marks of Despotic Authority. But it " is not to be believed, that the Counts pronoun- " ced judgment by themselves, and administered " justice in the same manner as the Bashaws do in " Turkey. In order to judge affairs, they as- " sembled a kind of assizes where the principal " men appeared. The Count's assistants were " generally seven in number, and as he was " obliged to have twelve persons to judge, he " filled up the number with the principal men. " But whoever had the jurisdiction, whether the " King, the Count, the *Grafio*, the *Centenarian*, " the Lords, or the Clergy, they never judged " alone; and this usage, which derived its origin " from the forests of Germany, (as also did the *beautiful system* of the admirable constitution), " was still continued even after the fiefs had as-  
 " sumed

“sumed a new form\*. He was not then to come and tell the French people, whose Kings did not judge alone in modern more than they had done in former times, that *all was over with them*, that Liberty was at an end, because the judiciary power was not separated from the legislative and executive powers.

It is easy to see what disquiet such principles must have created in the minds of his countrymen, and how they exposed the Royal Authority to odium and mistrust. But, alas! this work contains the origin of far greater evils.

Further error which begets the States-General.

Forewarned by experience of the troubles which accompanied the States-General, the French seldom recalled them to mind but to enjoy the peace and glory they had acquired under Monarchs, who by their wisdom had supplied the want of those ancient States. Montesquieu not only spread his false alarms on the legislative and executive powers of the Sovereign, but he was unfortunate enough to lay down as law to the people, that every state that wishes to believe itself free must only confide in itself, or its representatives, for the enacting of its laws. He was the first who said, “*As in a free State every man, who is supposed a free agent, ought to be his own governor*, so the legislative power ought to reside in the whole body of the

\* Chap. 18, Book XXX.

“ people. But since this is impossible in large States, and in small ones is subject to great inconveniences, *it is fit that the people should execute by their Representatives what they cannot execute by themselves* \*.”

This is not the place to observe what a multitude of errors these assertions contain: the chief is that of having converted into a principle what he had observed in England, without considering that often what has conducted one nation to Liberty, may lead another into all the horrors of Anarchy, and thence to Despotism. On seeing this opinion laid down as a general principle, the French believed, that to become a free state it was necessary for them to return to their former States-General, and vest them with the legislative power. And in order to throw the fiscal power also into their hands Montesquieu adds, “ If the legislative power were to settle the subsidies, not from year to year, but for ever, *it would run the risk of losing its Liberty*, because the executive power would no longer be dependent; and when once it was possessed of such a perpetual right, it would be a matter of indifference, whether it held it of itself, or of another. The same may be said, if it should fix, not from year to year, but for ever, the sea and land forces with which it is to entrust the executive power †.”

\* Chap. 6, Book XI.

† Ibid.

When

When we consider how little such a doctrine was ever thought of in France before Montesquieu had written; when we behold that swarm of scribbling copyists, who all repeat that Liberty is at an end wherever the people do not exercise the legislative and fiscal powers, either by themselves or by their representatives; when we compare this doctrine with that of the first revolutionary rebels, whether under the denomination of *Constitutionalists* or *Monarchists*; when we reflect that it was on such principles that Necker, Turgot, Barnave, Mirabeau, and La Fayette founded their systematic rebellion, do we not immediately infer (an awful truth indeed for Montesquieu, but which History can never hide), that it is to Montesquieu the French must trace that system which disjoins the sceptre and throws the Monarch into the hands of the people, who by means of their representatives proclaim their pretended laws; that system which recalls the States-General, who, soon styling themselves National Assembly, leave nothing to their King but the theatrical show of royal pageantry, until, carrying their consequences still further, the people assert their unbounded sovereignty by dragging the unfortunate Lewis XVI. to the scaffold.

History will be astonished when it beholds Montesquieu, ignorant of his system having been precisely that which the most inveterate enemies

of his country had formerly adopted, in hopes of diminishing the lustre and grandeur which it enjoyed under the dominion of its Kings. For ever will the memory of those servile copyists, the Constitutionalists and Monarchists, be odious to their country, when it shall be remembered that their main object was to subject their Monarch to the authority of the States-General, and thus consummate the very plan concerted by the foreign enemy.

His Systems coincide with those of the greatest enemies of the State.

All these wonderful men, who were so well versed in the English constitution, might during their researches have learned what every English school-boy was acquainted with, who, in his most tender years, on receiving Salmon's Geography must have read the following passage " January  
 " 16th, 1691, at the Congress of the Hague,  
 " consisting of the Princes of Germany, the  
 " Imperial, English, Italian, Spanish and Dutch  
 " ministers, a declaration was drawn up, wherein  
 " they solemnly protested before God, that their  
 " intentions were never to make peace with  
 " Lewis XIV, until the Estates of the kingdom  
 " of France should be established in their ancient  
 " liberties; so that the Clergy, the Nobility, and  
 " the Third-Estate, might enjoy their ancient  
 " and lawful privileges; nor till their kings for  
 " the future should be obliged to call together  
 " the said estates *when they desired any supply,*  
 " without



“ without whom they should not raise any money,  
 “ on any pretence whatever, and till the parlia-  
 “ ments of that kingdom and *all other his subjects*  
 “ *were restored to their just rights.* And the con-  
 “ federates invited the subjects of France to  
 “ join with them in this undertaking for restoring  
 “ them to their *rights and liberties*, threatening  
 “ ruin and devastation to those who refused \*.”

It is thus that, after thirty years of the most learned discussion and research on the part of Montesquieu, and forty years of new discussion on the part of his learned disciples, the Constitutionalists and Monarchists, that they adopt that plan for restoring their country to liberty which every English school-boy knew to have originated in the mind of the enemy, who wished to overturn the Throne, and tarnish the lustre which France had acquired under its Legislative Monarchs.

Had I already said it, I should nevertheless repeat, that the object here in debate is, not what the ancient constitution of France has been, nor whether their kings enjoyed the legislative power, (which has been very ill discussed by our modern politicians); still less are we disposed to agitate the question, which is the most perfect constitution in itself? Nobody will deny that government to

\* Edit. 1750. Page 309.

be the best, under which the people are happiest at home, and most formidable abroad; and such a reflection will suffice to show how baneful the doctrines broached by Montesquieu and repeated by the Sophisters of Rebellion must have proved to France: They who came to stun their countrymen with the pretended fears of despotism, alienating their minds from their own constitution to excite their admiration for foreign laws, and that at a time when the love of the subjects for their King was carried to enthusiasm after the tranquil ministry of the Cardinal Fleury, and the brilliant campaigns of the Marechal de Saxe in Flanders.

It may be difficult to decide how far this imprudent doctrine is to be looked upon as the error or as the perversion of genius; were we to appeal to the testimonies of his greatest admirers, we should not hesitate at the latter decision, and rank him among the Sophisters of Rebellion, as the sect appears to have done. D'Alembert rather accuses than defends him, when, answering those who complained of the obscurity of the *Spirit of Laws*, he says, "All that may appear  
 " obscure to common readers is not so to those  
 " whom the Author had particularly in view.  
 " Beside, *a voluntary obscurity* ceases to be obscure.  
 " Mr. de Montesquieu, often wishing to advance  
 " certain important truths, which, boldly and  
 " abso-

“ absolutely expressed, might have given offence  
 “ to no purpose, *very prudently disguised them, and*  
 “ *by this innocent artifice* hid them from those who  
 “ might have been offended, without destroying  
 “ their intended effect on the sage \*.” It is  
 difficult to pass over this *voluntary obscurity* in a man  
 who has advanced principles so subversive of the  
 laws and government of his country. His pretend-  
 ed *innocent artifices* would almost convince the reader,  
 that all those protestations of Montesquieu were  
 hypocritical and sophistical, when we see him, after  
 having strained every nerve to prove to most nations  
 that they are perfect strangers to liberty, and that  
 their kings are real despots, seeking every means  
 to dispel any suspicion of his being of that dis-  
 quiet, morose, and seditious temper which thirsts  
 after revolutions,

Nor is the suspicion removed by D'Alembert  
 when he compliments him as having “ diffused  
 “ that general light on the principles of govern-  
 “ ment which has rendered the people more  
 “ attached to *what they ought to love.*” What can  
 be the signification of “ what they ought to love”  
 in the mouth of this artful Sophister? Why  
 should he not have said more attached to their

\* Montesquieu's Elogy by D'Alembert at the head of the  
 5th volume of the Encyclopedia.

King

King and the Government of their country? But we have already seen how little this Sophister was attached to either the one or the other.

It is equally unfortunate, that his panegyrist, now that the name of Encyclopedist is so justly covered with opprobrium, should extol his zeal for that monstrous digest, whose object remains no longer a secret, or when the most revolutionary among the Sophisters positively assert, that *Montesquieu would not have written had not Voltaire written before him*. Condorcet, by advancing such a proposition, clearly means, that if Voltaire had not succeeded so well in his Anti-christian Conspiracy, Montesquieu would not have contributed so powerfully towards the political revolution; that if the one had been less daring against the Altar, the other would have dared less against the Throne.

In solving this unfortunate problem, what "damning proof" would be acquired against Montesquieu if the authenticity of a letter which appeared in one of the London papers could ever be ascertained! Voltaire and D'Alembert conspired against the Jesuits, because they believed that society to be one of the firmest props to religion; Montesquieu, if the letter be genuine, presses for their destruction, because he thought them too much attached to the Royal authority.

"We

“ We have a Prince, “ says he, “ who is good, but  
 “ weak. That society employs every art to  
 “ transform the Monarch into a Despot. If it  
 “ succeeds: I tremble for the consequences, civil  
 “ war will rage, and streams of blood will inun-  
 “ date every part of Europe.—The English  
 “ writers have thrown so great a light upon  
 “ Liberty, and we have so great a desire of pre-  
 “ serving what little of it we enjoy, that we  
 “ should make the worst slaves in the world.”

Were those violent and extreme measures  
 which we have since witnessed already taken?  
 This letter would indicate as much; beside, it is  
 entirely written in the style of a conspirator. It  
 is full of such expressions as these: “ If we can-  
 “ not write freely, *let us think and act freely*. We  
 “ must wait patiently, but never cease working  
 “ for the cause of Liberty. Since we cannot fly  
 “ to the pinnacle, let us climb.”

Could it be possible that Montesquieu had al-  
 ready formed the plan of driving out the Swiss  
 guards, and of calling forth the national guards of  
 the revolution? The following lines strongly denote  
 such a plan: “ What a point should we have  
 “ gained, if we could once get rid of those mer-  
 “ cenaries and foreign soldiers! *An army of natives*  
 “ would declare for Liberty, at least the greater  
 “ part of them would. But that is the very  
 “ reason

“ reason why foreign troops are maintained \*.” However difficult it may appear to vindicate Montesquieu from being a conspirator, if it be true that he was the Author of the above letter, still I must say what may absolutely excuse him. This letter may have been written in a moment of anger, and be the effect of one of those fantastical contradictions from which the greatest genius is not always exempt. Montesquieu had bestowed the highest encomiums on the Jesuits in his *Spirit of Laws* †; but that did not hinder them from condemning several of his propositions. The resentment of the moment might have induced him to wish for their destruction. It is generally known, that he was much more tender to criticism than could be supposed for a man of

\* It is earnestly requested of all persons who may have any further knowledge of that letter, or are in possession of the Newspaper in which it was published, that they will be kind enough to give such information to the Author at Mr. Dulau's, Bookseller, No. 107, Wardour-street. He cannot question the veracity of the Abbé le Pointe, who gave him the translation of it, taken from an Evening Newspaper about the latter end of 1795; but, not attaching the same importance to the letter which the Author would have done, the Abbé neither remarked the title nor the date of the paper which he translated it from, and *that* the Author hopes will plead his excuse for troubling his readers.

† Chap. 6, Book IV.

his

his superior genius. All his love of Liberty could not hinder him from applying to the Marquise de Pompadour to obtain the despotic order for suppressing and even for burning Mr. Dupin's *Refutation of his Spirit of Laws* \*.

We may observe various traits in this celebrated genius which are irreconcilable. He was very intimate with the Encyclopedian Deists and Atheists, but always very desirous that his friends should die good Christians, and that they should receive all the rites of the church. At that awful period he was an Apostle or Divine, he would exhort and insist until the sick person assented; he would run, though it were at midnight, to call the clergyman whom he thought the most proper to complete the conversion; at least such was his conduct with respect to his friend and relation Mr. Meiran †.

His works are equally fantastical. He speaks of religion in terms of the highest panegyric; nevertheless we have to guard against many an attack which he makes against it. In defending Christianity against Bayle, he tells us, that perfect Christians "would be citizens infinitely more enlightened with respect to the various duties of life. That the more they believed themselves indebted to religion, the more they would think

\* See Feller's Historical Dictionary. † Ibid.

" due

“ due to their country; that the Principles of  
 “ Christianity deeply engraved on the heart  
 “ should be infinitely more powerful than the  
 “ false honour of Monarchies, than the human  
 “ virtues of Republics, or the servile fear of De-  
 “ spotic States \*.” And yet he lays aside that  
 religion, and continues to make this false honour  
 and these human virtues the prime movers of  
 Monarchies and Republics! He represents the  
 Christian religion as the most consonant to Mo-  
 narchy †; and he has said before, “ There is no  
 “ great share of probity or virtue necessary to  
 “ support a Monarchical Government—That in  
 “ well regulated Monarchies, they are almost all  
 “ good subjects, and very few good men—That  
 “ in a Monarchy it is extremely difficult for the  
 “ people to be virtuous ‡;” that is to say, that  
 the Christian religion is the most consonant  
 with Monarchies, but that it is the most  
 difficult for the people to follow under that go-  
 vernment. He writes in the midst of a people  
 then the most distinguished for its love to its So-  
 vereign, and his whole system appears to be cal-  
 culated for a nation enslaved under the severest  
 Despotism, and of which Terror is the prime  
 agent. Certainly, either the beloved Monarch is  
 not a Despot, or fear is not the prime agent of

\* Chap. 6, Book XXIV.

† Chap. 3, Book XXIV.

‡ Chap. 3 and 6, Book III.

Despotism.



Despotism. Might not all this be comprised under what D'Alembert calls *innocent artifices*? but another cause may be surmised.

Montesquieu declared in his last moments, that if he had hazarded any expressions in his works which could cast a doubt on his belief, "it was owing to a taste for novelty and singularity; to a wish of passing for a transcendent genius soaring above prejudice and common maxims; to a desire of pleasing and of obtaining the plaudits of those men who directed the public opinion, and who were never more lavish of theirs than when one appeared to authorize them to throw off the yoke of all dependence and restraint\*." This avowal would lead us to infer, that there was a greater taste for novelty and singularity in his political systems than in his religious ideas. He always preserved a sufficiency of his religious education to respect Christianity, though not enough to guard against those political systems which might and really did gain him that applause which he so much sought for, I mean that of the modern Sophisters, who, with their new-fangled ideas of Liberty and Equality, thought themselves authorized to shake off the yoke of all dependance. I cannot believe that he conspired with them; but that he forwarded their plans is too certain. And

\* See Historical Dictionary.

such will be our opinion, till the before-mentioned letter can be authenticated \*. He did not conspire by setting up his systems, but his systems formed conspirators. He created a school, and in that school systems were formed, which, improving on his, rendered the latter more fatal.

\* It is certainly a most extraordinary coincidence, that while our Author, though obliged to state the revolutionary principles laid down in Montesquieu's works, does all he can to exculpate him from any evil intention, Bertrand Barrere, the sanguinary Reporter of the successive Committees of General Safety which have butchered France, and who was himself at length involved in the downfall of Robespierre, after having been his agent during his whole reign of terror, should have been writing precisely at the same time a long declamatory pamphlet under the title of *Montesquieu peint par lui-meme*, claiming the honours of the Pantheon for him, as one of the Doctors of Democracy and a Progenitor of the French Revolution. He even declares his object to be no other than to form an Edition of Montesquieu for the use of Republicans. Could it be possible that men of Barrere's stamp were the persons whom D'Alembert meant to design when he said, "All that may appear obscure to common readers *is not so to those whom the author had particularly in view*; besides, a *voluntary obscurity* ceases to be obscure?" T.

---

CHAP.

### CHAP. III.

*Jean Jaques Rousseau's System.*

HOWEVER cautiously Montesquieu may have expressed himself, the grand principle of all Democratic Revolutions was nevertheless laid down in his writings. He had taught in his school, "that in a free state, every man who is supposed " a free agent ought *to be his own governor* \*." This axiom evidently implies, that no man nor any people can believe themselves free, unless they are their own legislators; and hence it was natural to conclude, that there hardly existed a nation on earth that had a right to believe itself free, or that had not some bonds to burst in order to extricate itself from slavery.

Scarcely could England even flatter itself with the real enjoyment of this liberty; and we see Montesquieu not venturing to assert it when he adds, "It is not my business to examine whether the English actually enjoy liberty or not. It is sufficient for my purpose to observe, that it is established by their laws, and I inquire no farther †." Though this may have satisfied the master, it might not be sufficient for all the disci-

\* Chap. 6, Book XI.

† Chap. 7, Book XI.

ples ; and some one of them might answer, that according to his principle the English laws were far from granting that liberty inherent to a people governing itself.

It is evident, that to believe in their own freedom the English were obliged to deny this principle as too general, and certainly they were entitled to reply, “ With us liberty consists in the  
 “ right of freely doing all that the law does not  
 “ forbid ; and every Englishman, whether rich  
 “ or poor, is equally free, whether he have the  
 “ requisites for being an elector or not, whether  
 “ he make the law by his direct vote, or by his  
 “ deputies ; or even if he does not in the least  
 “ contribute toward it. For in all these cases he  
 “ is certain of being judged by the same law.  
 “ The Foreigner even is as free among us as our-  
 “ selves, when he is willing to observe our laws,  
 “ for he may do as freely as ourselves all that is  
 “ not forbidden by the law.”

If England could justly reproach Montesquieu with the generality of his principle, what must have been the case with other nations, such as France, Spain, Germany, or Russia, where the people do not partake, either by themselves or by their representatives, of the power of enacting laws ? What was to be said of all those republics, either in Switzerland or Italy, where the three powers are united in the senate, where, to use  
 Montef-

Montesquieu's expression, *the power being one*, he thinks *he discovers and dreads at every step a Despotic Prince?*

It was a necessary consequence, either that this principle must have been done away; or that all Europe, persuading itself that it groaned under slavery, would attempt, by a general Revolution in all Governments, to cast off the yoke. Some great genius must have arisen who could have counteracted the fatal shock given by this illustrious author. But for the misfortune of Europe the very reverse came to pass.

Montesquieu was not only admired and extolled, as he deserved, in consideration of many parts of his Spirit of Laws, but he was more especially venerated for those passages in which, by means of his principles on Liberty, Equality and Legislation, he aspersed the existing governments with the imputation of Slavery. The Sophisters easily overlooked his restrictions, his protestations, *his obscurities and his innocent artifices*, because they conceived it to be sufficient that he had opened the path, and shown how far it might lead.

The first who undertook to widen this path was Jean Jaques Rousseau, that famous citizen of Geneva, whom we have already seen so powerfully forwarding the conspiracy against the altar. He was in every shape the man of whom the Sophisters of rebellion stood in need to conduct them

Jean Jaques following up Montesquieu's principle, and more daring in his consequences.

in their attack against the Throne. Born a citizen of a Republic, he imbibed with his milk, as he says himself, *the hatred of Kings*, as Voltaire had done that of Christ. He was better versed than Montesquieu in that dangerous talent of propagating error with the tone of importance, or of presenting paradox as the result of deep thought. He possessed, above all, that boldness which neither admits principles by halves, nor shrinks at their consequences. He surpassed his master, and in his political theories greatly outstripped him.

The *Spirit of Laws* appeared in the year 1748, and The *Social Contract* in 1752. Montesquieu had revived the ideas of Liberty and Equality; but Jean Jaques construes them into supreme happiness. "If we examine," says he, "in what  
" the *supreme happiness of ALL* consists, which  
" ought to be the grand object of every legisla-  
" ture, it will appear to center in these two points,  
" LIBERTY AND EQUALITY. In *Liberty*, because  
" all private dependence is so much strength sub-  
" tracted from the body of the state; in *Equality*,  
" because Liberty cannot subsist without it \*.

Man  
every  
where in  
slavery,  
accord-  
ing to  
Jean  
Jaques.

Montesquieu had not dared to decide whether the English were free or not; and at the very time when he was passing the most severe criticism on other governments, he sheltered himself under the

\* Social Contract, Chap. 11, Book II.

inten-

intention of not wishing to *vilify* or *debase* any one. Jean Jaques was above such cautions; he begins his work by saying, *Man is born free, and yet we see him every where in chains* \*.

Montesquieu had surmised, that to believe himself free it was necessary that *man should be his own governor*; that he should act according to his own laws, and according to his own will. But he judged the means of execution to be difficult in a small state, and impossible in a large one. Jean Jaques would have believed the principle false had he found it impossible in practice. But he believed the principle, as laid down by Montesquieu to be true in theory; and to surpass his master he had only to demonstrate its possibility, and to facilitate its execution. This constitutes his favorite problem:

To find a form of association which “ will de- Object of  
 “ fend and protect with the whole aggregate force Jean  
 “ the person and property of each individual; and Jaques’s  
 “ by which every person, while united with ALL, system.  
 “ *shall obey only HIMSELF, and remain as free as*  
 “ *before the union;*” such is the fundamental  
 “ problem, says Jean Jaques, of which the Social  
 “ Contract gives the solution †.” This was in  
 other terms precisely seeking to realize Montesquieu’s principle; to give to each man who feels

\* Chap. 1, Book I.

† Chap. 6, Book I.

himself a free agent the means of being his own governor, and of living under no other laws than those which he has himself made.

His object erroneous.

How a man, after having entered into the Social Contract, is to find himself as free as if he had never engaged in it, is not easily conceived; or, how a man who has subjected himself to the will of the majority can be as free as when his actions were to be directed solely by his own will, is equally inconceivable. This was precisely saying, that the object of civil society is to preserve that Liberty which is anterior to government, or of the state of nature; though the Social Contract, according to all received ideas, expressly imports the sacrifice of part of that Liberty to preserve the rest, and to obtain at that price, peace and security to one's person, property, and families; in short, all the other advantages of civil society.

The solution of this problem became more difficult when Jean Jaques asserted, that "it is evident, that the first wish and intention of the people must be, that the state should not perish\*." According to their second maxim, it was not essentially necessary to be one's own governor, or to act always according to one's own will, and to live under laws enacted by oneself; but to have good laws, whoever might have been

\* Chap. 6, Book IV,

the



the legislator, and to be governed so as to save the State.

But contradictions could not thwart Jean Jaques in his career. He wished to realize Montesquieu's principle. He sets off on the supposition, that every man, a free agent, is to be his own governor; that is to say, that every free people are to obey those laws solely which they have themselves enacted: and in future he never views the law in any other light than *as the act of the general will*. Such a proposition immediately annuls all laws which had ever been enacted by any King, Prince, or Emperor, without the participation of the multitude; nor does Jean Jaques hesitate in saying, "It is unnecessary to inquire to whom belongs the function of making laws, because the laws are but the acts of the general will. The legislative power belongs to the people, and can belong only to them. Whatever is ordered by *any* man of his own accord is not law. For the people, to be subjected to laws, must enjoy the right of making them \*.

I.  
Consequence.  
The people sole legislator.

Such was the first principle which Jean Jaques deduced from his master's distinction of the three powers. The second was not less flattering for the multitude. All Sovereignty, according to Jean Jaques, resided in the power of Legislation.

II.  
The people sovereign.

\* Chap. 6, Book II.

In

In giving this power to the people, he concluded *the people were Sovereign*; and so much so, that they had not the power *of submitting to another Sovereign*. All submission on the part of the people is represented in this new school as a violation of the very act by which every people exists; and to violate this act was to annihilate their own existence; and as a further consequence he concludes, that all submission on the part of any people is null in itself, for this great reason, that *by nothing nothing can be performed* \*.

Lest he should not be understood, we see Jean Jaques frequently repeating both the principle and the consequences. "The Sovereignty, he says, being no more than the exercise of the general will, can never alienate itself. If therefore a people promise unconditionally to obey, the act of making such a promise dissolves their existence, and they lose their quality of a people; for at the moment that there is a *master* there is no longer a Sovereign, and the body politic is destroyed of course †."

It was impossible to say in a clearer manner to all nations, Hitherto you have been governed by Kings whom you looked upon as Sovereigns; if you wish to cease being slaves, begin by taking the Sovereignty to yourselves, that you may enact

\* Chap. 7. Book I.

† Chap. 1. Book II.

your

your own laws; and let your Kings, if you wish to keep them, be no more than servants, to obey your laws, and to see them observed by others.

Montesquieu feared that a legislative people would not be sufficiently enlightened for the discussion of laws and affairs in general; but this fear had not made him relinquish the principle. Jean Jaques, insisting on the principle, could see nobody more proper than the people to carry both principle and consequence into practice. In this new system, the general will of the people was not only to frame the laws, but in the making of those laws became infallible. For he says, "the general will is always right, and tends always to the public advantage. The people can never be bribed, yet they may be deceived \*." But in whatever manner they may be deceived, this *Sovereign people, by its nature, must, while it exists, be every thing that it ought to be †.*

III.  
The people infallible in their laws.

To compensate for the incapacity of the people in the framing of laws, Montesquieu proposed representatives, or men who should make the laws for them. Jean Jaques would not allow these men to be representatives in any thing but in name: He contended, that Montesquieu, in causing deputies to be chosen, placed the people under at-

IV.  
Sole representative.

\* Chap. 3, Book II.

† Chap. 7, Book I.

tornies

tornies and barristers, that is to say, under men who were to plead their cause as a guardian does that of his ward. But neither attornies nor guardians could be looked upon as real representatives. That these men, whose judgment the people would be obliged to receive as law, might differ both in will and opinion from the people; in fine, it was giving absolute legislators to the people, and thereby divesting it of the legislative power. He further observes, that the will of the people could be no more represented by these deputies than that of a ward by his guardian. And he adds, in spite of his master, "*The Sovereign, (the people) which is only a collective being, cannot be represented but by itself; the power may be transferred, but not the will.*" Besides, the Sovereign power may say, 'my will at present agrees with the will of such a man, or at least with what he declares to be his will;' but it cannot say, 'our wills shall likewise agree to-morrow,' as it would be absurd to think of binding the will for any time to come \*."

V.  
The people above  
the laws.

From these reasonings certain qualities and rights are inferred, which Montesquieu would not perhaps have refused to the Sovereign people, but which he had not dared to express. This Sovereign made the law; and, whatever might be

\* Chap. 1, Book II.

the

the law made by the people, *it could not be unjust*, as no person can be unjust towards himself.

The Sovereign people make the laws, but no law can bind them. "For, continues Jean Jaques, "in every case the people are masters, to change "even the best laws: for, if that body is disposed "to injure itself, who has a right to prevent "it \*?"

In short the great difficulty which Montesquieu found in free men being their own governors and legislators lay in the impossibility of holding, especially in great states, the assemblies of this legislative people. These inconveniences, or even impossibilities, vanish before Jean Jaques, because he felt that either the principle was to be abandoned, or the consequences to be followed up; and neither Parliaments nor States General could suffice for him; he wished for real assemblies of the whole people. "The Sovereign, having no "other force but the legislative power, acts only "by the laws; and the laws being only the authentic acts of the general will, the Sovereign *can never act but when the people are assembled*. "Some will perhaps think, that the idea of the "people assembling is a mere chimera: but, "if it be so now, it was not so two thousand years "ago; and I should be glad to know whether

VI.  
Assemblies of  
the people.

\* Chap. 12, Book II.

"men

“ men have changed their nature ? The limits  
 “ of possibility, in moral things, are not so con-  
 “ fined as many are apt to suppose them : it is  
 “ our weakness, our vice, and our prejudice, that  
 “ narrow the circle. The abject mind distrusts  
 “ the very idea of a great soul ; and vile slaves  
 “ hearken with a sneer of contempt when we talk  
 “ to them of Liberty \*.”

Examples  
 of a sove-  
 reign peo-  
 ple false.

However confidently Jean Jaques may have laid down this doctrine, still the examples which he adduces to corroborate it were far from demonstrating that these assemblies of the Sovereign had ever existed. The citizens, for instance, of Rome or Athens were perpetually flocking to the forum ; but those citizens, especially the people of Rome, were not the Sovereign people and every where Sovereign. The Empire was immense, and the people in this immense Empire, so far from being Sovereign, were a people enslaved by a Despotic Metropolis, by an army of *four hundred thousand soldiers* called Citizens, always ready to burst forth from an entrenched camp called *Rome*, to crush any town or province which should dare to assert its own liberties. Athens followed the same conduct with respect to its colonies and allied towns.

\* Chap. 12, Book III.

These

These examples adduced by Jean Jaques only showed what the French Revolution has, since, so well demonstrated: that when the inhabitants of an immense town, like Rome or Paris, take up arms, they may style their Revolutions by the names of Liberty and Equality, but all the real distinction is, that in place of one King whom they may have banished or murdered, the inhabitants are transformed into four or five hundred thousand Despots and Tyrants over the Provinces, while they in their turn are tyrannized by their tribunes. Are not the ashes of Lyons, are not the unfortunate people of Rouen or Bourdeaux the unhappy examples that may be cited to show what fate awaited the miserable town that might attempt to shake off the yoke of the suburbs of St. Marceau, St. Antoine, or of the citizens of Paris? And has not that immense town paid its tribute to a Robespierre at one time, and at another to the five Kings?

At some times, however, Jean Jaques was sensible of these inconveniences. But he would not on that account abandon his grand principle of the Sovereignty of the people, nor even the general assemblies. He would, after Montesquieu's example, have recourse *to the virtue* of Republics or of the Sovereign people; but he would even reproach Montesquieu with a "frequent want of precision in not making the necessary distinctions," and

Jean  
Jaques re-  
proaches  
Montes-  
quieu.

“ and not perceiving, that, the Sovereign authority being every where the same, the same principle must prevail in every well constituted state.” Then he would add, “ that there is no government so subject to civil wars and internal agitations, as the democratic or popular one ;” (that is to say, as the state of which virtue is the basis) “ because there is not one which has so strong and so continual a tendency to change its form, which can only be preserved by the vigilance and courage employed to maintain it \*.”

He even then confesses, that “ if there were a nation of Gods, *they* might be governed by a Democracy ; but so perfect a government will not agree with men †.” Yet then, lest, after Montesquieu’s example, he should be wanting in precision, he proscribes all great empires from the sweets of liberty ; he would allow of none but small states ‡, of one town in each state ; and capitals are in his plan particularly excluded §.

VII.  
Division  
of states.

His doctrine on this point is precise enough, when he says, “ no city, any more than a nation, can be lawfully subjected to another, because the essence of the body politic consists in the perfect union of obedience and liberty, and because the words *Subject* and *Sovereign* are the identical

\* Chap. 4, Book III. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.  
§ Chap. 13, Book III.

“ co-relatives



“ co-relatives whose meaning is united in the word  
 “ *Citizen* \*.” That is to say in a plain style, that  
 all the Sovereigns and Subjects of a given state are  
 only the burgeses of the same town. That a *Ci-*  
*tizen*, subject and sovereign of London, has no au-  
 thority at Portsmouth or Plymouth, and the citi-  
 zens, subjects and sovereigns of these latter or any  
 other towns cannot be subject to a sovereign which  
 inhabits another town. And Jean Jaques conti-  
 nues, “ It is always wrong to unite many cities  
 “ in one (that is to say in one empire) ; it would  
 “ be absurd to speak of the abuses prevalent in  
 “ great states, to those who would wish to form  
 “ only small ones. But it is proper to consider,  
 “ how sufficient strength can be communicated to  
 “ small states, to defend them from the attacks of  
 “ great ones? The reply here is, that they must  
 “ follow the footsteps of the Grecian cities, which  
 “ formerly resisted the power of the great King ;  
 “ and of Holland and Switzerland who more re-  
 “ cently withstood the house of Austria †.” All  
 which meant, that in this system of Liberty and  
 Equality applied to the sovereign people it was  
 necessary to subdivide the greater states into small  
 federative democracies.

“ In fine, if it be impossible to reduce a state  
 “ within proper limits, (notwithstanding his ad-

\* Chap. 13, Book III.

† Ibid.

“ miration for Rome), there is still one measure  
 “ to be adopted—that of not allowing a capital,  
 “ or settled seat of government, but moving it in  
 “ rotation to every city, and assembling the states  
 “ of the country alternately 'in the same man-  
 “ ner \*.”

Left it should be objected to our Philosopher, that to form these little democracies, would only be subdividing the larger states into so many lesser provinces, which would be for ever a prey to *civil war and intestine divisions*, and always *tending to change their form*, which he declares to be the lot of all democracies, he is pleased to grant existence to aristocracies. These, and particularly “ the  
 “ Elective Aristocracy, which is the true one, are  
 “ the best of all governments †.” But whether Democracy, Aristocracy, or Monarchy be adopted, the people always remain sovereign; the general assemblies of the sovereign are always requisite, and they were to be frequent, “ and so ordered as to assemble of course at the stated period, without  
 “ being formally convened, not leaving it in the  
 “ power of any Prince or Magistrate to prevent  
 “ the meeting *without openly declaring himself a*  
 “ *violinator of the laws*, and an enemy to the  
 “ state ‡.”

\* Chap. 13, Book III. † Chap. 5, Book III.

‡ Chap. 18, Book III.

Jean

Jean Jaques, more consequent than his master, follows up the principle he had borrowed from Montesquieu, and continues, "at the opening of these assemblies, whose object is the maintenance of the social treaty, two questions should always be proposed, and never on any account omitted; and the suffrages should be taken separately on each—The first should be, Does it please the Sovereign (the people) to preserve the present form of government? And the second, Does it please the people to leave the administration with those who are at present charged with it \*?" That is to say, to continue the Magistrate, the Prince, or the King, whom they had chosen.

VIII.  
Questions to be made at the assemblies of the people.

These two questions in the system of the sovereignty of the people are only consequences of the great principle laid down by Montesquieu, *that every man feeling himself a free agent ought to be his own governor*. For this man, or people, feeling themselves free agents, might not chuse to be governed to-day after the same manner they were governed yesterday. If they were unwilling, how could they be free agents, when obliged to maintain that government and those chiefs which they had formerly chosen.

Such a consequence would have made any Philosopher less intrepid than Jean Jaques abandon

\* Chap. 18, Book III.

the principle. Without pretending to Philosophy, one might have told him, 'that every people which foresaw the misfortunes that perpetual revolutions in their government exposed them to, might without vilifying or enslaving themselves, have chosen a Constitution and sworn to maintain it. They might have chosen Chiefs, Magistrates, or Kings, who were bound by oath to govern according to that Constitution: a compact which it would be no less criminal to violate, than the most sacred oath (and equally so to-morrow as to-day). If the people are supposed to sacrifice their Liberty by a compact of this nature, you will call every honest man by the degrading name of slave, who shall think himself bound by the promise he made yesterday, or the oath he took to live according to the laws of the state?' But such reasonings would have had little weight with Jean Jaques. In his opinion, it was a great error to pretend, that a Constitution equally binding for the people and their chiefs was a compact between the people and the chiefs they had chosen; because (says he) "it would be absurd and contradictory to suppose, that the Sovereign should give itself a superior; and that, to oblige itself to obey a master, would be to reinstate itself in the fullness of Liberty\*."

• Chap. 16, Book III.

Such

Such was the consequence naturally flowing from the idea of the sovereignty of the people, of the people essentially sovereign, who to be free must be their own governors, and who must retain, notwithstanding all their oaths, the right of annulling to-day those very laws, which yesterday they swore to maintain. This conclusion, however strange it may appear, is nevertheless that in the application of which the Revolutionary Sophister particularly exults when he says, "when it happens therefore that the people establish an hereditary government, whether it be Monarchical in family, or Aristocratical in one order of Citizens, *it is not an engagement which they make*, but a provisional form given to Administration, until it shall please the Sovereign to order otherwise\*." That is to say, until it shall please the people to expel their Senate, Parliament, or King.

IX.  
Kings  
only provisional.

Let not the reader be astonished at seeing me insist so much in these memoirs on the exposition of such a system. The application of the causes to the effects will be more evident when the Historian treats of the acts of the French Revolution. But should he wish to know more particularly, how much our Philosopher of Geneva influenced the warfare which the Revolution had kindled against every throne, let him examine how this

\* Chap. 18, Book III.

Sophister applies his principles to Monarchies, and the lessons that he teaches to all nations respecting their Kings.

X.  
Every  
Monar-  
chy a real  
Democrá-  
cy.

Here again it was Montesquieu who had laid the ground-work, and Jean Jaques raised the superstructure. He, walking in the footsteps of his master, admits the absolute necessity of separating the Legislative from the Executive Power, but, always more daring than Montesquieu, he scarcely leaves to Monarchy its very name. "I therefore  
" denominate every State a Republic which is re-  
" gulated by laws, under whatever form of admi-  
" nistration it may be; for then only the public  
" interests governs, and the affairs of the public  
" obtain a due regard.—*To be legitimate*, the go-  
" vernment should not be confounded with the  
" Sovereignty, but be considered as its admini-  
" strator; and then Monarchy itself would be a  
" Republic \*."

These last words seem to imply, that Jean Jaques recognized at least the legitimacy of a King who would receive the law from the people, and who, acquiescing in their sovereignty, would submit to be a simple administrator, in a word their slave. For, according to this system, the only free man is he who makes the laws, and the only slave he

\* Chap. 6, and Note to Book II.

who

who receives them. The people were to make the law, the King to receive it; the King therefore is only the slave of the sovereign people.

On such conditions Jean Jaques consents to recognize a King in great empires; but he teaches the people at the same time, that it is owing to their own faults if a King be necessary in such a state. They would have learned to govern themselves without one if they had reflected, that *the greater the enlargement of the state, the more Liberty is diminished* \*; that their real interest would have been to occupy a space of ground a hundred times less extensive, in order to become a hundred times more free; that if it be difficult for a large state to be properly governed, it is still more so for it to be *well-governed by one man*.

XI.  
To govern without Kings if possible.

In fine, whatever states these may be, we are never to forget, according to this Philosopher, that the whole dignity of those men called Kings *is certainly no more than a commission*, under which, simply as officers of the sovereign power, they exercise in the name of the Sovereign the power delegated to them, and which may be limited, modified, or recalled at the will of the Sovereign †.

XII.  
Kings mere Officers which the People may depose.

Even on these conditions, had Jean Jaques succeeded according to his wishes, Kings, though

\* Chap. 1, Book III. † Ibid.

reduced to mere Officers or Commissioners for the Sovereign people, would not have had a long existence. This wish is clearly expressed throughout the whole of his Chapter on Monarchy \*. There he has heaped up every argument against Royalty, whether hereditary or elective; there, extolling the supposed virtues of the multitude, he beholds the throne invaded by Tyrants, or vicious, covetous and ambitious Despots. Nor did he fear to add, that if we were to understand by KING him who governs *only for the welfare of his subjects*, it would be evident that *there had never existed one from the commencement of the world* †.

The direct consequences of this whole system evidently were, that every nation desirous of preserving its rights of Liberty and Equality, was in the first place to endeavour to govern itself without a King, and to adopt a Republican Constitution; that nations who judged a King necessary, were cautiously to preserve all the rights of Sovereignty, and never to lose sight, in quality of Sovereigns, of their inherent right of deposing the King they had created, of shivering his scepter, and of overturning his throne, whenever, and as often as they pleased. Not one of these consequences startled the Philosopher of Geneva. He was obliged to admit them, lest it should be ob-

\* Chap. 6, Book III. † Note to Chap. 19, Book III.

jected



jected (as he had done against Montesquieu) that *he sometimes wanted precision!* and once more to leave the world a prey to slavery. Had it been objected, that it was precisely among those nations who carried their ideas of Liberty, Equality, and Sovereignty to the greatest lengths, that the greatest number of slaves were to be found, he would have contented himself with answering,

"Such, it is true, was the situation of Sparta.— XIII.

"But as to you, people of the present day, you <sup>All na-</sup>

"have no slaves, *but are yourselves enslaved.*— <sup>tions</sup>

"You purchase their Liberty at the expence of <sup>slaves</sup>

"your own. Forbear then to exult in a prefer- <sup>at pre-</sup>

"ence which discovers, in my opinion, more of <sup>sent,</sup>

"indolence than of humanity \*."

It is evident that Rousseau, always more lively and more daring than his master, could not suppress any of the consequences which flowed from the principle laid down by Montesquieu. He brands every nation, even the English, with slavery, declaring them all to be slaves under their Kings.

To have surpassed his master in politics was not <sup>His reli-</sup> sufficient. Montesquieu is often lax, even in- <sup>gion</sup> <sup>Deism.</sup>nuates error, and, notwithstanding all the eulogy he bestows on Christianity, appears sometimes to sacrifice the religious virtues to politics; yet he

\* Chap. 15, Book III.

appeared

appeared too timid to his disciples. Jean Jaques, more dogmatic, declares openly that he knows of no Religion *more destructive of the social spirit* than that of the Gospel ; and he paints a true Christian as a being always ready to bend his neck under the yoke of a Cromwell or a Catiline.

Montesquieu had mentioned the *Catholic Religion* as particularly adapted to moderate Governments and Monarchy ; the *Protestant Religion* as appropriate to Republics \*. Jean Jaques will neither allow of the Catholic nor of the Protestant Christian, and finishes his system with Bayle's famous paradox that Montesquieu had refuted. He conceived no Religion but Deism to be worthy a Sovereign, equal, and free people ; and in order to undermine every throne, he banishes from the state every altar where the God of Christianity was adored †.

This conclusion alone raised Jean Jaques far above Montesquieu in the eyes of the Sophisters. Time was to decide which of these two systems should bear away the palm of victory. Let the historian compare the effects of each, observing their nature and successive progress of opinion. He will then be less surprized at beholding that school triumph which is regardless of the sanctity of the Altar and of the authority of the Throne.

\* Spirit of Laws, Chap. 5, Book XXIV.

† See Social Contract, Chap. 8, Book IV.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV,

*Third Step of the Conspiracy.*

*The general Effect of the Systems of Montesquieu and  
Jean Jaques.*

*Convention of the Sophisters—The Coalition of their  
Plots against the Throne, with their Plots  
against the Altar.*

IN comparing the two Systems that we have just exposed, it is easy to remark, that the respective authors of those Systems have been biassed in their application of the ideas of Liberty and Equality to polity by the different stations which they held in life. The first, born of that class in society that is distinguished by riches and honours, participated less of those ideas of Equality which confound every class of citizens. Notwithstanding his great admiration for ancient Republics, he observes, that “ In every state there are always persons distinguished by their birth, riches, or honours; “ but were they to be confounded with the common people, and to have only the weight of a “ single vote like the rest, the common liberty “ would be their slavery, and they would have no “ interest

Why  
Montes-  
quieu  
aims at  
Aristo-  
cracy.

“ interest in supporting it, as most of the popular  
“ resolutions would be against them \*.”

It was this system which was at an after-period to induce the Jacobin Club to style Montesquieu the *Father of Aristocracy*; and it appears that he was led to the adoption of this idea by the supposition that the class of citizens (the parliament) to which he belonged, would become legislators; and thus, enjoying his distinctive mark of liberty, would be their own governors, and would never obey any but their own laws. The care he had taken not to generalize his ideas, excepting when treating of the island where he had learned to admire them, screened him from all censure, and removed any imputation of his wishing to overturn the constitution of his country, in order to introduce that of another. But such a precaution did not repress that desire which he had kindled in the breasts of many of his readers, a desire of seeing that constitution, which he so much extolled, established in their own country, a desire also of the only laws congenial to liberty, those of a country where each person is his own governor.

Why his  
system is  
extolled,  
and by  
whom.

The French at that period, little accustomed to political discussions, rather enjoyed the advantages of their government under the laws of their Mo-

\* Spirit of Laws, Chap. 6, Book XI.

narch,

narch, than cavilled at his authority. They were free under their laws, nor did they lose their time in disquisitions on the possibility of being so, though they had not participated in the making of them. The novelty of the subject irritated the curiosity of a nation with whom the bare title of *Spirit of Laws* was sufficient to captivate their suffrages. Besides, it contained an immense fund of learning; and in spite of many witty reflections, even bordering on epigram, a strong feature of moderation and candour laid further claim to the public esteem. The English also admired it. Notwithstanding Montesquieu's reserves, it was but natural for them to extol so great a genius, whose chief error lay in having believed that their laws and their constitution were sufficient to impart liberty to all nations, whatever might be their moral or political position on the globe.

The esteem in which a nation, perhaps at that time its most worthy rival, had always held Great Britain, added much to the high repute of the *Spirit of Laws*. It was translated into several languages; and it would have been a disgrace for a Frenchman not to have been acquainted with it. I hope the expression I am going to make use of will be forgiven; that poison, that true source of the most democratic of all revolutions, infused itself without being perceived. The ground-work is entirely comprized in the principle, that *Every man*

*man who is supposed a free agent ought to be his own governor, which is absolutely synonymous with another, viz. "it is in the body of the people that the legislative power resides."* Those members of the aristocracy who admired Montesquieu, had not sufficiently weighed the consequences of this grand axiom. They did not perceive that the Sophisters of rebellion would one day only change the terms, when they proclaimed that the *law* was but the *expression of the general will*, and hence conclude, that it is a right inherent in the people or multitude to enact or abrogate all laws; and that should the people change and overturn every thing at pleasure, they would do no more than exercise a right.

He for-  
wards  
Demo-  
cracy.

When Montesquieu passed over these consequences, or rather pretended not to see them; when, viewing the different Monarchies of Europe, he finds himself obliged to confess that he knew of no people, one excepted, who exercised the pretended right of governing themselves, and of making their own laws; when he adds, that the less they exercised that right, the more *the Monarchy degenerated towards Despotism*; when, declaring that Liberty was at an end wherever those powers which were generally concentrated in the person of the Sovereign, were not distinct, he seems to console nations, by flattering them with a greater or smaller portion of Liberty, for which  
they

they were indebted to what he calls prejudices, to their love of *the Subject's, the State's, and the Prince's glory* \* ; in what cloud could he have enveloped himself? After having laid down principles which stigmatize all nations as in a state of slavery, will he pretend to appease their minds by speaking of what little Liberty prejudice may have left them? Are not these some of the *voluntary obscurities* which D'Alembert styles *innocent artifices*? Or, are we to join with Jean Jaques in accusing Montesquieu of *not being precise, and being often obscure*?

Be this as it may, such were Montesquieu's principles, that it was impossible to adopt them either in France or elsewhere, without inviting those awful revolutions which, snatching the most important branch of the Royal prerogative from the Monarch, invest the people with his spoils. After the *Spirit of Laws* only one thing was wanting to operate such a Revolution; and that was, a man who, sufficiently daring, would assert these consequences without fear, perhaps even complacently, because he beheld in them a means of annihilating all titles or distinctions, which decorate stations of life superior to his own. The son of a poor artizan, in a word Jean Jaques Rousseau, bred in a watchmaker's shop, proved to be this daring man. He grasped the weapons which

\* Chap. 7, Book XI.

Montesquieu had forged to assert the privileges of the multitude, and ascertain the rights of legislation and sovereignty in the poor workman as the former had in the rich man; in the commoner as in the nobleman. The whole aristocracy of Montesquieu was no more than a scaffolding for the Sophisters of rebellion; and if he ever uses the word *Aristocracy* as expressing the best government, it was only in its original signification; he does not understand by it the government of the wealthy and noble classes, but that of the *best* of each, whether rich or poor, who were to be chosen magistrates by the people; and then in the very aristocracy he constitutes the people Legislators and Sovereigns.

Comparison and natural effects of the two systems.

Montesquieu believed the Nobility to be necessary intermediates between the King and the People. Jean Jaques detested these intermediate bodies, and thought it absurd that a sovereign people should stand in need of them. Montesquieu parcels out the authority of Kings, to adorn the aristocracy of riches and nobility with one of its fairest branches. Jean Jaques, penniless, shivers the scepter of his King, and proscribes the prerogative of nobility or wealth, and to assimilate himself to the Peer or Nobleman he invests the Sovereignty in the multitude. Both foreboded Revolutions; both taught nations that they laboured under the yoke of slavery, whatever may have been



been their protestations to the contrary; both led nations to believe, that the liberty of the subject could never be ascertained until they had adopted new Constitutions and new Laws, and had chosen chiefs, who, more dependent on the people, would ensure the liberty of the subject at the expence of their own.

Both, in giving their ideas upon Liberty, instructed nations in what they ought to do to acquire this supposed Liberty. Public opinion, like the two systems, was to be restrained within certain limits with Montesquieu, or expand itself to any lengths with Jean Jaques, according to the strength, preponderance or multitude of disciples which interest might have enrolled under the banners of either of these modern politicians. Every reflecting person could already foresee, that all the rebels of Aristocracy would follow Montesquieu as their chief; but that all the lower classes, and all the enemies of Aristocracy, whether from hatred or jealousy, would fight under Jean Jaques.

Such must have been the natural effect of these two systems according to the progress they made in the public opinion. This effect, it is true, might have been counteracted by opinions still predominant among many nations, whom these false ideas of Liberty had not misled so far, as to make them believe they lived in slavery, because they were governed by the laws of their Princes.

All these revolutionary principles must have been fruitless in nations whose religious tenets teach and ordain submission to their lawful Sovereign, in nations where the Gospel was followed and respected, a Gospel which equally proscribes injustice, arbitrary and tyrannic power in the Prince, and rebellion in the Subject, which, teaching the true worship of the King of Kings, does not instil pride into nations by stunning them with the repeated proclamation of their sovereignty.

But the Sophisters of Impiety had undermined the foundations of the Religion of the Gospel, and numerous were their impious adepts. Many had been led to impiety by their ambition, and by the jealousy they had conceived against those who enjoyed distinctions or exercised power, and they soon perceived that by means of these two systems, the same ideas of Liberty and Equality, which had proved such powerful agents against Christianity, might prevail also against all political Governments.

The Sophisters  
conspire,  
and adopt  
the system  
against  
Kings.

Till this period, the hatred which the school of Voltaire, or the brethren of D'Alembert, had conceived against Kings was vague and without any plan. In general, it was a mere thirst after Liberty and Equality, or a hatred of all coercive authority. But the necessity of a civil government stifled all their cries. Here they were convinced, that to destroy was not sufficient, and that  
in

in overturning the present laws, it was necessary to have another code to replace the former.— Their writings teemed with epigrams against Kings, but they had not attacked their rights; Despotism and Tyranny were represented in the most sarcastic light, though they had not yet declared that every Prince was a Despot or a Tyrant. But this was no longer the case when these two systems had appeared; Montesquieu taught them to govern themselves, and make their laws in conjunction with their Kings; and Jean Jaques persuades them to expell all Kings, and to govern and make their laws themselves. The Sophisters no longer hesitate, and the overthrow of every throne is resolved on, as they had before resolved on the destruction of every altar. From that period the two conspiracies are combined and form but one in the school of the Sophisters. It is no longer the isolated voice of a Voltaire, or of any particular adept who, following the explosions of his brain, raises a sarcastic cry against the authority of Kings; it is the combined efforts of the Sophisters leagued in plots of rebellion and impiety, aiming all their hatred, their means, their wishes and their artifices, at teaching all nations to destroy the throne of their Kings, as they had formerly excited them to overturn the altars of their God.

Such an accusation is important, it is direct; and the proofs are taken from the words of the conspirators themselves. It is not only the simple avowal of the conspiracy, but the exulting pride of the Sophister who glories in his crime. He paints the hypocrisy, the wickedness, the hideousness of his crime in as glowing colours as if he had delineated the triumph of genius and wisdom, in a word of true Philosophy, in the cause of the happiness of mankind. Let us attend, and we shall hear them tracing the history of their plots, which they represent as the climax of human understanding in Philosophical learning.

Proofs of  
the con-  
spiracy.

The French Revolution had hurled the unfortunate Lewis XVI. from his throne, when the most unrelenting conspirator, that monster Condorcet, thinks it incumbent on him to celebrate the glory of Philosophism, and trace the progress of this fiend which had kindled the torch of discord and had reared the Republic on crime, bloodshed, and the ruins of the throne. Lest the school whence these horrid deeds had issued, should not be known, he describes it from its origin, and histories all the monsters of iniquity and rebellion which each century had produced. He then descends to the new Republican æra. That history may carefully weigh his evidence and appreciate his avowal, his words shall suffer no alteration: without interruption from us he may extol his  
school

school and its pretended benefactions. He supposes us at the middle of this century, considers his reader as arrived at that period when the delirium of superstition is dispelled by the first rays of modern Philosophy. Then it is that he develops the following plot as the history and triumph of his false Philosophy.

“ *There was a class of men which soon formed* Avowal of Con-  
 “ *itself in Europe* with a view not so much to dorcet.  
 “ discover and make deep research after truth as  
 “ to diffuse it: whose chief object was to attack  
 “ prejudices in the very asylums where the Clergy,  
 “ the Schools, the Governments, and the ancient  
 “ Corporations had received and protected them ;  
 “ and made their glory to consist rather in de-  
 “ stroying popular error than in extending the  
 “ limits of science: this, though an indirect  
 “ method of forwarding its progress, was not on  
 “ that account either less dangerous or less use-  
 “ ful.

“ In England Collins and Bolingbroke, in  
 “ France Bayle, Fontenelle, Voltaire, Montes-  
 “ quieu, and *the schools formed by these men*, com-  
 “ bated in favour of truth. They alternately em-  
 “ ployed all the arms with which learning and  
 “ Philosophy, with which wit and the talent of  
 “ writing could furnish reason. *Assuming every*  
 “ *tone, taking every shape*, from the ludicrous to  
 “ the pathetic, from the most learned and exten-

" five compilation to the Novel or the petty  
 " Pamphlet of the day, covering truth with a  
 " veil, which, *sparing the eye that was too weak,*  
 " incited the reader *by the pleasure of surmising*  
 " *it*, insidiously caressing prejudice in order to  
 " strike it with more certainty and effect; seldom  
 " menacing more than one at a time, and that  
 " only in part; sometimes flattering the enemies  
 " of reason *by seeming to ask but for a half tolera-*  
 " *tion in Religion or a half Liberty in polity; re-*  
 " *specting Despotism when they impugned religious*  
 " *absurdities, and Religion when they attacked ty-*  
 " *ranny; combating these two pests in their very*  
 " *principles, though apparently inveighing against*  
 " *ridiculous and disgusting abuses; striking at the*  
 " *root of those pestiferous trees, whilst they appeared*  
 " *only to wish to lop the straggling branches; at one*  
 " *time marking out superstition, which covers despo-*  
 " *tism with its impenetrable shield, to the friends of*  
 " *Liberty, as the first victim which they are to im-*  
 " *molate, the first link to be cleft asunder; at another*  
 " *denouncing it to Despots as the real enemy of their*  
 " *power, and frightening them with its hypocriti-*  
 " *cal plots and sanguinary rage; but indefatigable*  
 " *when they claimed the independence of Reason and*  
 " *the Liberty of the Press as the right and safeguard*  
 " *of mankind; inveighing with enthusiastic energy*  
 " *against the crimes of Fanaticism and Tyranny;*  
 " reprobating every thing which bore the character  
 " of

“ of oppression, harshness, or barbarity, whether in Religion, Administration, Morals or Laws; commanding Kings, Warriors, Priests and Magistrates in the name of nature to spare the blood of men; reproaching them in the most energetic strain with that which their policy or indifference prodigally lavished on the scaffold or in the field of battle; in fine, adopting *reason, toleration, and humanity* as their signal and watch-word.

“ Such was the Modern Philosophy, so much detested by those numerous classes whose very existence were drawn from prejudices—Its chiefs had the art of escaping vengeance, though exposed to hatred; *of biding themselves from persecution, though sufficiently conspicuous to lose nothing of their glory* \*.”

Had rebellion, impiety, and revolt wished to trace their means and ascertain their object, could they have made a better choice than the pen of Condorcet to delineate the actors, describe their detestable plots, and fix the epoch of their double conspiracy, which, first aiming at the altar, is afterward directed and pursued with fury against all Kings and Rulers of nations. How could their means and plots have been rendered more manifest? How could the hero of the plot, or the

Result of  
this  
avowal.

\* Esquisse d'un tableau historique de l'esprit humain, 9 Epoque.

adept most intimately initiated in the mysteries of the conspiracy, have more evidently pointed out the object, the double tendency of the Sophisticated school; or shown in a clearer light the wish of destroying the throne springing from the league which they had formed against the altar?

Let the historian seize on this avowal or rather on this eulogy of plots. He will find concentrated and flowing from Condorcet's pen, every thing that the most daring and the deepest initiated conspirator could have let fall, to characterize the most authenticated and most universal conspiracy, planned by those men called Philosophers, not only attacking the persons of particular Kings but of every King, and not Kings only, but the very essence of Royalty and all Monarchy. The commencement of this conspiracy was when Collins, Bolingbroke, Bayle, and other masters of Voltaire, together with that Sophister himself, had propagated their impious doctrines against the God of Christianity.

We see it fast rising into eminence when Montesquieu and Jean Jaques, nearly his contemporary, applying their ideas of Liberty and Equality to Polity, had given birth to that disquiet spirit which sought to investigate the rights of Sovereigns, the extent of their authority, the pretended rights of the free man, and without which every subject is branded for a slave—and every King  
 styled



styled a Despot. In fine, it is that period when their systems, by means of empty theories, furnish the Sophisters with a means of supplying the want of Kings in the government of nations.

Until that period the sect seemed to have carried their views no further, than to the establishment of Philosophic Kings, or Kings at least who would let themselves be governed by Philosophers; but, despairing of success, they league in the oath of destroying all Royalty, the very instant they shall have found in any system the means of governing without Kings.

The persons who compose this school of conspirators are strongly marked. They are the authors and adepts of this *Modern Philosophy*, who, before they resolved on the destruction of Monarchy, began by raising their heads against Religion; who, before they depicted every Government in the colours of Despotism and Tyranny, represent fanaticism and superstition as the sole growth of Christianity.

The extent, the means, the constancy of the conspiracy all are shown in the clearest light.— Our conspiring Sophisters pretend to *ask but for a half-toleration in Religion or a half-liberty in Polity; respecting authority of Kings when they impugned Religion, and Religion when they attacked Royalty.* They pretend to *inveigh only against abuses*; but both Religion and the authority of Monarchs are  
but

*but two pestiferous trees, at whose very roots they strike. They are the two giants whom they combat in their principles, that every vestige of their existence might be annihilated.*

*They assume every tone, they take every shape, and artfully flatter those whose power they wish to destroy. They spare no pains to deceive the Monarch whose throne they undermine. They denounce Religion as the real enemy of their power, and never cease reminding their adepts, that it is Religion which covers Kings with an impenetrable shield: That it is the first victim to be immolated, the first link to be cleft asunder, in order to succeed in shaking off the yoke of Kings, and in annihilating Monarchy, when once they should have succeeded in crushing the God of that Religion.*

The whole of this wicked game is combined among the adepts; their action, their union cannot be better delineated. Their watch-word is *Independence and Liberty*. They all have their secret, and during the most vigorous prosecution of their plots *they sedulously conceal them. They nevertheless covertly pursue them with an indefatigable constancy.* What can be called conspiracy, if this is not conspiring against all Kings; and how could the Philosophers more clearly demonstrate, that the war which they waged against Christ and his Altar, against Kings and their Thrones, was a war of extermination?

I still

I still fear its being objected, that the Philosophers did not mean to point at Royalty by the words *Despotism and Tyranny*. I have already said, that the Despots and Tyrants whom the Sophisters were to destroy could be no other than those Monarchs under and against whom they did conspire; and if the unfortunate Lewis XVI. was a Tyrant and a Despot in their eyes, the mildest and the most moderate of Monarchs must have been guilty of Tyranny and Despotism. But let it not be thought that these conspiring Sophisters were always restrained by a sense of shame from casting aside the veil of Despotism and Tyranny with which they had shrouded the hatred they had conceived against Royalty. The same Condorcet who may be supposed (at the head of the Sophisticated bands) to have attacked only Tyranny and Despotism, leaves us no room to doubt.

Scarcely had the original rebels called Constitutionalists left the name or phantom of a Monarch to France in the unfortunate Lewis XVI. so greatly had they abridged the regal authority; and most unjustly could that unfortunate Prince, in his degraded state at least, be accused of Despotism or Tyranny; nevertheless the designs of the Sophisters had not been fulfilled, and it is Condorcet who undertakes to shew the extent of their views. Royalty was still preserved as to the name; and Condorcet now no longer exclaimed,  
“ Destroy

“ Destroy the *Tyrant*, the *Despot*,” but “ *destroy the KING.*” Speaking in the name of the Philosophic sect, he proposes his problems on Royalty in the most direct language. He entitled them *Of the Republic*; and the first question he proposes is, *Whether a King is necessary for Liberty?* He answers it himself, and declares that Royalty is not only unnecessary and useless *but even contrary to Liberty*, that it is irreconcilable with Liberty; and after having solved this problem, he continues: “ As to the reasonings which may be brought against us, we will not do them the honour of refuting them; much less shall we trouble ourselves to answer that swarm of mercenary writers, who have such good reasons for believing that a Government cannot exist without a civil list, and we will give them full liberty to treat those persons as madmen who have the misfortune to think as the sages of every age and nation have done before them\*.”

It is thus that, from the mouth of that Sophister, who was the most deeply initiated of the adepts, we learn, without the least subterfuge, the extent of their plots; such were the wishes of his pretended sages. It is not only Despotism but Royalty itself, it is even the empty name of an imprisoned King, that is incompatible with Li-

\* *Of the Republic*, by Condorcet, an. 1791.

erty.

berly. What then is necessary to accomplish their last views with respect to Kings as well as to the Priesthood? These views are not confined to France alone, no, not even to Europe; but they extend to all nations, to the whole globe, to every region on which the sun shines. It is no longer a wish it is a hope, it is the confidence of success, which makes [the same Sophister, adopting the prophetic strain, announce to Kings and the Priesthood, that, thanks to the union, toils, and unrelenting warfare of the Philosophers, " the day will come when the sun shall shine on none but free men, a day, when man, recognizing no other master than his reason, when Tyrants and their Slaves, when Priests, together with their stupid and hypocritical agents, will have no further existence but in history or on the stage \*." At length the whole extent of their plots is revealed, and revealed by that adept who was at the head of the Sophisticated school; by him, whom the original masters had judged to be the most proper person to succeed them and as most strongly fired with their spirit; by him, in fine, who proves to be their *greatest consolation* in their last moments, as they leave a chief to their school worthy of themselves †. That their con-

\* Of the Republic, by Condorcet, epoch 10.

† Voltaire to D'Alembert, let. 101, an. 1773.

spiracy

spiracy might be compleat, the *Royal Authority* and the *Priesthood* were not to exist but in history or on the stage. In the former, as the subject of calumny and all the imprecations of the sect ; on the latter, as an object of public derision.

Evidence  
of many  
other  
adepts.

Condorcet is not, however, the only one of the Sophisters, who, exulting in the success of their double conspiracy, lay open its source and shew it springing from that concert and understanding of the Sophisters, uniting their means, their labours, and directing them at one time against the throne, at another against the altar, with a common wish of crushing both the one and the other. Condorcet is, without doubt, the Sophister who betrays the greatest vanity on the subject, because he is the adept who, scoffing at all shame and disclaiming every moral sentiment, would blush the least in describing those artifices which he so complacently relates ; for it was he that could with the least embarrassment reconcile that atrocious dissimulation, those tortuous plans, those snares laid at once for Priests, Kings, and Nations, to the rules of honour, probity, and truth ; while the whole conduct of his school exhibits a concatenation of guilt and cunning, unworthy of the Philosopher, and becoming the odious conspirator only. Many other adepts speak their true sentiments, when they declare their belief that the publication of their proceedings

ings can be no bar to the success of the conspiracy.

The Editors of the *Mercure*, La Harpe, Marmontel, and Champfort, had nearly been as explicit as Condorcet, when they published the following sentence, "It is the arm of the people that executes Revolutions; but it is the meditations of the sage that prepare them." These adepts, like Condorcet, represent our pretended sages as directing by silent and tortuous means, the minds of the people toward that Revolution which was to shiver the scepter of Lewis XVI. and whose grand object was to *break* the pretended yoke of the *Priesthood* in order to *break that* of the pretended *Tyrants*, of Tyrants such as Lewis XVI. the most humane and just of Kings, and whose fondest pursuit was the happiness of his subjects. Before Condorcet and our Sophisters of the *Mercure* many other adepts had shewn this concert and union, and had claimed the honour of this Revolution menacing every throne, as the glorious achievements of their school. Let us hearken to a man illustrious in the annals of Philosophism, and whom as such we may suppose well informed as to their plots.

Mr. de la Metherie is not one of the common class of adepts; on the contrary, he was one of those who had the art of insinuating Atheism with all the seduction of natural science. So early as on the

La Harpe  
and Mar-  
montel.

La Me-  
therie.

the 1st of January 1790, this adept, who was deservedly looked upon as one of the most learned of the sect, begins his observations and memoirs with these remarkable words : “ At length the “ happy day is come when Philosophy triumphs “ over all its enemies. They are obliged to own, “ that it is the light which Philosophy has “ spread, more especially of late years, that has “ produced *the great events which will distinguish “ the end of this century.*” What are these great events which the learned Atheist claims in the name of Philosophy ? They are those of a Revolution which discovers man *breaking the shackles of slavery*, and shaking off the yoke with which *audacious Despots* had burthened them. It is the people recovering their *inalienable right*, of making alone the laws, of deposing Princes, of changing or continuing them according to their will and pleasure, and of viewing their Sovereigns in no other light than as men who cannot infringe these popular laws *without being guilty of treason to the people.* Lest the principles on which these pretended rights were founded should be forgotten, he repeats them with enthusiastic eloquence ; lest the glory of such lessons and their consequences should be attributed to any but the masters of his school ; lest, in short, the intention and concert of its authors should not be sufficiently evident, he tells us, and that at the very moment when the unfortunate

Lewis



Lewis XVI. is the sport of that legislative and sovereign populace, “ It is these truths repeated thousands and thousands of times by the Philosophers of humanity, that have operated those precious effects, so long expected;” he carefully adds, that if France is the first to burst the fetters of Despotism, it is because the Philosophers had prepared them for such noble efforts *by a multitude of excellent writings*. And that we might be acquainted to what extent these successes prepared by Philosophy are to be carried by the concert of these lessons repeated *thousands and thousands of times*, the adept La Metherie continues, “ The same lights are propagating throughout other nations, and soon they will cry out like the French, *we are determined to be free*—Let the brilliant success *which Philosophy has just gained* be a new spur to their courage—*Let us be persuaded that our labours will not be fruitless.*”

The foundation of this hope (and never let the historian lose sight of this observation, since the Philosophers incessantly repeat it) rests on the prospect of an approaching Revolution in religious matters. It is because sects equally inimical to Royalty and Christianity are daily increasing in numbers and strength, particularly in *North America* and in *Germany*. It is because the new tenets *are silently propagated*, and that all these sects unite their efforts with those of Philosophism.

VOL. II.

L

He

He delineates the extent of their hopes, by declaring that Philosophy, after having conquered Liberty in America and France, will carry its conquests on the one side into Poland, on the other into Spain and Italy, and even into Turkey; nay, more, that it will penetrate into the most distant regions; and that Egypt, Syria, and India itself, shall be tributary to it\*.

Were it necessary to seek further proof that this Revolution had been the work of the combined efforts, of the wishes and labors of our modern Sophisters, La Metherie will tell us, that he had clearly announced it to all Sovereigns when he said, "Princes, do not deceive yourselves—TELL  
*" raises the standard of Liberty, and he is followed  
 " by his fellow citizens.* The whole power of  
 " Philip II. could not prevail against Holland;  
 " and a chest of tea liberates America from the  
 " yoke of the English. In all energetic nations  
 " Liberty raises itself on the ruins of Despotism;  
 " but Joseph II. and Lewis XVI. were far from  
 " thinking this warping regarded them. May  
 " Kings, Aristocrats, and Theocrats profit by this  
 " example!" Should they continue deaf to his voice, the same sage will shrug his shoulders, and, pitying, say, "These privileged persons are bad  
 " calculators of the course of the human mind

\* Observations on Experimental Philosophy and Natural History, January 1790. Preliminary Discourse.

" and

“ and of the influence of Philosophy ; and let  
 “ them remember that their fall in France was  
 “ accelerated by the neglect of such calcula-  
 “ tions \*.”

Another Philosopher not less vain than La Gudin. Metherie, extolling and revealing the plans, intentions and plots of the sect, with nearly as much perspicuity as Condorcet, is also acknowledged by it for one of its profoundest adepts. This is Gudin, who, adding his reveries to those of Jean Jaques, makes the glory of his masters consist not only in the principles and the wish of the revolution, but in all they had done to bring it about, and which enabled them *to announce it as infallible*.

This adept Gudin goes much further ; for he tells us, that it was not the intention of the Philosophers to operate this Revolution by the arm of the people, but by means of the King and his Ministers ; that they had forewarned them that it was in vain for them to pretend to stop it. According to him, “ these same Philosophers who, under  
 “ the ancient order of things, had told the King,  
 “ his Council, and his Ministers, *that these changes*  
 “ *would take place in spite of them, if they would not*  
 “ *adopt them*, say at this present day to those who  
 “ oppose the constitution, that it would be im-  
 “ possible to return to the old form of govern-

\* *Idem*, January 1791, page 150.

“ ment, whichever might be the party that carried the day, it being too imperfect and too much discredited even by the enemies of the new constitution \*.”

These men therefore, whom we see to-day, under the name of Philosophers, so numerous and such zealous partizans of that Revolution which dethrones Kings; which invests the Sovereignty in the hands of the people, and executes systems the most directly opposite to the authority of Monarchs; these men, before they attempted to accomplish their plans by the arm of the people, had already revolutionized the public opinion to that degree, and were so certain of their success, that they boldly threatened both Kings and their Ministers, if they would not adopt their Revolutionary ideas, with the completion of that long wished for Revolution, in spite of all opposition.

It would be endless to quote the multitude of proofs which attest, that Philosophism only waited for the success of its plots, to glory in having contrived them. The historian will find those proofs in the numerous discourses pronounced by the adepts, either at the legislative club called National Assembly, or at the regulating club called the Jacobins; scarcely will he hear the name of Philosophers pronounced in these revolutionary

\* Supplement to the Social Contract, Chap. 2, Part III.

dens,

dens, without the grateful acknowledgment of their being the authors of the Revolution.

I could adduce proofs of a different nature. The adepts, for example, who many years before the Revolution entrusted with their secret those whom they wished to gain over to their party. I Bergier, could name that Counsellor, that Sophister Bergier, whom Voltaire mentions as the most zealous adept \*. I am acquainted with the person to whom this secret was entrusted five years before the Revolution, in the Park of St. Cloud, to whom Bergier without the least hesitation said, that the time was not distant when Philosophy would triumph over Kings and the Priesthood. That as to Kings, their Empire was at an end, and that the downfall of the grandees and nobility was equally certain. That the plans had been too well laid, and things were too far advanced, to leave room for any doubt of success. But the man who has since entrusted me with these secrets, though he gave them to me in writing, will not consent to have his name mentioned. He, like many others, at that time believed the dogmatic assertions of the Sophister, whom he knew to be one of the most profligate of the sect, to be those of folly. And at present like many others, not conceiving how much it imports to history that facts of this kind

\* Gen. Correspondence.

should be authenticated by witnesses of known veracity, he sacrifices that grand object to the delicacy of not betraying what appears to have been but a confidential communication.

Alfonse  
Le Roi.

Bound by such scrupulosities, I am obliged to pass over many such anecdotes, that would show the Sophisters entrusting the secrets of their plots, and foretelling as clearly as Bergier did, the downfall of Kings and the triumph of Philosophy. I will consent even to suppress the name of a French nobleman who, resident in Normandy, received the following letter: " Monsieur Le Comte, do  
" not deceive yourself. This is not a sudden  
" storm. The Revolution is made and consum-  
" mated. It has been preparing for these last  
" fifty years, and that by some of the greatest  
" geniuses in Europe. It has its abettors *in every*  
" *cabinet*. There will be no other Aristocracy  
" but that of wit, and you certainly will have a  
" greater claim to that than any body else." This letter was written, a few days after the taking of the Bastille, by Alfonse le Roi, a physician. It needs no comment.

Testimo-  
ny of the  
repenting  
Le Roi.

It is now time to call my reader's attention to that other Le Roi whom we have mentioned in the first part of our Memoirs. He is not the vain Sophister glorying in his plots, not a Condorcet, a La Metherie, a Gudin, or an Alfonse, who exultingly behold the triumph of Philosophy in the  
crimes

crimes perpetrated and in the plots framed against the Altar and the Throne, No, this is the shame-faced and repenting adept, whom sorrow and remorse oblige to reveal a secret bursting from him in the agony of grief. But both the repentant and the proud adept perfectly agree in their evidence. For it would be a strange error to believe, that the declaration of Le Roi and the object of his remorse were confined to the Antichristian Conspiracy. At the period when he made his declaration neither the constitution nor the oath of apostacy had been decreed. It had not as yet been proposed to plunder and profane the temples, and to abolish the public worship. No blow had been given to the symbol of Christianity. All was prepared and daily starting into existence ; but as yet the assembly had only trespassed against the political authority and the rights of their Sovereign. It was at the sight of these first crimes that Le Roi is reproached with the miserable effects of his school, and it was to this reproach he answered, *To whom do you say so ? I know it but too well, and I shall die of grief and remorse.* When he disclosed all the heinousness of the plot framed by his secret academy at the Hotel d'Holbach, when he declares that it was there that the Conspiracy, whose dire effects they then beheld, had been formed and carried on ; the plots which he detests are those that he sees attacking the Throne. If he declares

L 4

those

those at the same time which had been formed against the altar, it is because they had been the forerunners of the above, because it was necessary to show that the hatred which the people had conceived for their King, arose from that which had been instilled into them against their God. Thus while the declaration of this unhappy adept authenticates the conspiracy of the Sophisters against religion, it equally demonstrates that contrived against the Throne.

It would be in vain to object that this unhappy man loved his King; he calls all present to witness that he is attached to the person of Lewis XVI.; how could he then join in a conspiracy against him? But it is in vain, all is consistent, all is combined in this mind racked with remorse. This unhappy Secretary of the Conspiring Academy might have loved the person of the Monarch, but detested Monarchy, detested it at least as it existed, and in the light in which his masters had taught him to consider it, that is to say, as irreconcilable with their principles of Liberty, Equality, and Sovereignty of the people. We shall see hereafter, that opinions differed very much in this secret academy. Some wished to have a King, or at least to preserve the appearance of one in the new projected order of things; others, and they were to carry the day, objected to the very name or any appearance of Royalty, and both parties  
were



were unanimous in their attacks against Royalty as then existing. The one wished for a Revolution partly combined of Montesquieu's system, partly of Jean Jaques's. The other wished to establish it on the consequences which Jean Jaques had deduced from Montesquieu's principles. But both were leagued in Rebellion, and both conspired to bring about a Revolution. The repenting adept wanted a half Revolution, nor did he believe that the people, when put in motion, would proceed to those excesses which he detested. He flattered himself that the Conspiring Philosophers who stirred up the populace would be able to direct its motions; that they would inspire this populace with a proper respect for the person and even for the dignity of a Prince whom he loved and respected as a Frenchman and a Courtier, while as a Sophister he dethroned him. This is all that his remorse and his protestations of attachment for the person of Lewis XVI. can indicate. He wished to make him a King subservient to the views and systems of the Sophisters, and he reduced the unfortunate Monarch to be the object of the licentious outrages of the populace; such are the real causes of his grief and remorse.

But the more this remnant of affection for his King appears in his declaration, the more it corroborates his avowal. It is not without cause that a man accuses himself of having pierced the bosom  
of

of the person he loves, or of having been concerned in a conspiracy against a Monarch whose Throne he with regret beholds menaced with ruin. People do not accuse themselves of crimes which they detest. Let us weigh the declaration of the repenting adept. What has Condorcet, proud and vainly exulting in the Conspiracy of Philosophism against the Throne, told us, which the unhappy Le Roi sinking under shame and remorse has not confirmed ?

Their testimonies compared.

The haughty adept tells us, that of the disciples of Voltaire and Montesquieu, that is to say, of all the principal authors of that impiety and sophistical polity of the age, a school or sect was formed uniting and combining their labors and their writings to effectuate the successive overthrow of the religion of Christ and of the Thrones of Kings. The repentant adept shows us these same disciples of Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Jean Jaques, uniting and coalescing under the fictitious name of Oeconomists at the Hotel d'Holbach ; and he says it was there that the adepts dedicated their labors and their lucubrations to the perversion of the public opinion on the sacred subjects of Religion and the rights of the Throne. " Most of those " works (his declaration says) which have appeared " for a long time past against *religion, morality,* " *and government,* were ours, or those of Authors " devoted to us. They were composed by the " mem-

“ members or by the orders of the society \*.” The unhappy Le Roi not only says against religion and morality, but also against *government*; and had he not said it, the one would be the natural consequence of the other; for the greatest part of the writings issued from this club of the Baron d’Holbach unite both objects. Soon we shall see them equally aiming at the overthrow of the Throne and of the Altar. They were the same Sophisters who had combined in one and the same plot the destruction of both.

The adept Condorcet complacently dwells on the art with which the coalesced Sophisters directed their attacks now at the Clergy then at Kings; covering truth with a veil which spared the eye that was too weak, artfully caressing religious opinions, to strike at them more surely, stirring up with still greater art Princes against the Priesthood, and the People against their Princes, fully resolved to overturn both the Altar of the Priest and the Throne of the Prince. Are not these the same stratagems which the repenting adept describes when he says, “ before these impious and “ seditious books were sent to the press, they “ were delivered in at our office. There we revised and corrected them, added to or curtailed “ them according as *circumstances* required. When

\* See Part the 1st of these Memoirs, page 325.

“ our

“ our Philosophy was too glaring for the times,  
 “ or for the object of the work, we brought it to  
 “ a lower tint ; and when we thought that we  
 “ might be more daring than the Author, we  
 “ spoke more openly \*.” As to its object, its  
 means, and its authors, we see the account of this  
 double conspiracy perfectly coinciding, whether  
 given by the haughty Condorcet or the repenting  
 Le Roi. Both demonstrate this school conspiring  
 against their God and against their King, flattering  
 themselves with success against Monarchy, and  
 generating that Revolution which was to overturn  
 their thrones, but not till that period when the  
 faith of nations, long before disordered, weakened,  
 and at length misled by the snares of the Sophi-  
 sters, threatened but a slight resistance to their  
 attacks either against the Altar or the Throne.

The enthusiastic pride of Condorcet, and the  
 shame and remorse of the penitent Le Roi, cer-  
 tainly had never concerted this consistency in their  
 depositions. The one, hardened in impiety and  
 rebellion, preserves his secret till that period when  
 he thinks he may violate it without endangering  
 the success of his wicked pursuits. He enjoys at  
 length, he glories in this success, and represents  
 his accomplices as men to be revered as the bene-  
 factors of mankind. The other, as it were to

\* See Part the 1st of these Memoirs, page 325.

extenuate his crime, the very instant his eyes are open to the heinousness of his past conduct, names those who have seduced him, discloses the place where they conspired, but to curse it; and throws all the weight of his crimes on his perfidious masters, on Voltaire, D'Alembert, Diderot, and their accomplices. He beholds these men who have seduced him in no other light than as monsters of rebellion. When such opposite passions, such different interests and sentiments agree in their depositions on the same conspiracy, on the same means, and on the same conspirators, truth can require no further proofs; it is evidence, it is demonstration itself.

Such then is the first problem of that Revolution so fatal to Monarchy. Voltaire forwards it with all his might in conspiring against his God, in spreading his doctrine of modern liberty and in artfully attacking with his sarcastic wit and satire the pretended despots of his own country and of Europe. Montesquieu traced in his systems the first steps toward that disorganizing liberty. Jean Jaques adopts Montesquieu's principles and enlarges on their consequences. From the Equality of the *legislative* people, he deduces the Equality and Liberty of the *sovereign* people; from the people essentially free and exercising the right of deposing their Kings at pleasure, he teaches the people to govern without them. The disciples  
of

First steps  
of the  
Conspiracy  
com-  
pared.

of Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Jean Jaques, united and coalesced in their secret academy, league also in their oaths; and of those oaths that of crushing Christ and of annihilating Kings form but one. Had the proofs of these plots been supported neither by the boasting of the haughty Sophister exulting in success, nor by the declaration of the penitent adept ready to expire at the sight of such successes, still what we have to unfold of this mazy coalition, would equally demonstrate both its existence and its object from the publicity of the means employed by the sect.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

*Fourth Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.**Inundation of Antimonarchical Books.**Fresh Proofs of the Conspiracy.*

THE very fact of the Conspiracy against Monarchy having been carried on by the same men and in the same secret academy where the Antichristian Conspiracy had been debated and conducted with such unrelenting fury, will induce the reader to suppose that many of the artifices employed against the Altar were equally directed against the Throne. The most fatal attack on Christianity, and on which the Sophisters had bestowed their chief attention, was that which they made with the greatest success to imbue the minds of the people with the spirit of insurrection and revolt. Nothing proves this with more certainty than the care with which they combined their attacks against the Throne with those against the Altar, in that inundation of Antichristian writings which we have seen flowing like a torrent through every class of society. This second inundation of Antimonarchical writings, by which the Sophisters were

The authors identical-ly the same in both conspiracies.

were in hopes of perverting that sentiment of confidence and respect, which the people had for their Sovereign, into hatred and contempt, was only a continuation of those means which they had employed against their God. These writings are issued from the same manufactory, composed by the same adepts, recommended and reviewed by the same chiefs, spread with the same profusion, hawked about from the town to the village by the same agents of Holbach's Club, sent free of cost to the country school-masters, that all classes of people from the highest to the most indigent might imbibe the venom of their Sophistry. As it is certain that these writings were the grand means of the Sophisters in their conspiracy against Christ, so it is equally certain, that these same productions, monstrous digests of the principles of impiety and of those of rebellion, are irrefragable proofs that these same Sophisters had combined the most impious of plots against their God with the most odious machinations against all Kings.

Why  
their at-  
tacks on  
the  
Throne  
are mani-  
fested so  
late.

One only difference is to be observed, that the first productions of the Secret Society were not so strongly tainted with the blast of rebellion. The grand attack against Monarchy was reserved until the sect should have reason to expect that their principles of impiety had prepared the multitude for their declamations against Royalty, as they had gradually swoln in those against the pretended super-  
stitutions



perstitutions of Christianity. Most of those violent declamations against Sovereigns are posterior not only to Montesquieu's, and Rousseau's systems, but even to the year 1761, when we beheld Voltaire reproaching the Sophisters with seeing every thing topsy-turvy, because in some of their writings they trenched upon the Royal Prerogative.

The Philosophers of the Encyclopedia had only alluded very faintly, in their first edition of that incoherent compilation, to the principles of that Liberty and Equality which have been since so much extolled by the enemies of Royalty; though it was a cause of reproach to D'Alembert, that even in his preliminary discourse *he sees but a barbarous right in the inequality of stations*; and though the Royalist or even the Subject of every state, of every Government, might have objected to the insertion in the Encyclopedia of that proposition which the Jacobins have since so often repeated, "that the subjection in which every man is born with respect to his father or to his Prince, has never been looked upon as a tie binding unless by his own consent\*." In short, though the Encyclopedists were the first to enter the lists in defence of Montesquieu, yet the fear of alarming the public authorities made them act with great

\* See the Philosophical Memoirs of the Baron XX. Chap. 2, on the Art. GOVERNMENT of the Encyclopedia.

circumspection during many years on this subject. It was necessary to wait for new editions. That of Iverdun was still too early ; and it was in the edition of Geneva that these revolutionary principles first made their appearance. Lest they should escape the notice of the reader, Diderot had repeated and condensed the poison, had decked them with all the array of Sophistry in at least three different articles\*. There neither Montesquieu, Jean Jaques, nor all the admirers of the legislative and sovereign multitude, could have cavilled at a single link in this brilliant concatenation of Sophisms. This perhaps might have given rise to those fears which Voltaire expresses in his correspondence with D'Alembert, lest this edition should not obtain the free circulation which he wished for in France. These fears, however, were ill grounded, for it became the most common in use ; but at that period, that is to say, in 1773, the Conspirators had begun the inundation of those Antimonarchical Writings from the secret academy, which the slightest examination will prove to have had no other tendency, as Le Roi has since declared, than to overthrow religion, morals, and *government*, and particularly those governments where the chief power is invested in the Monarch.

\* See Edition of Geneva Articles, DROIT DE GENS, ÉPICURÉENS, ECLECTIQUES.

In

In order to show their concert on this last object as we have on the other two, let us suppress, if possible, the indignation which must naturally arise on reciting the lessons of the Sophisters. Let us say to all subjects of Monarchies, to all subjects of Aristocracies, and even of all Republicans not as yet jacobinized, 'If you tremble at the sight of revolutions which menace your government, learn at least to know the sect which prepares these revolutions by means of the principles which it artfully insinuates.'

Concert of  
the Sophi-  
sters  
against  
every go-  
vernment  
existing.

All religions and all governments are equally doomed to destruction by the Sophisters. They wish to establish every where a new order of things both in church and state. We see them all, or nearly all, teaching us, that there scarcely exists a single state on the whole globe where the rights of the equal and sovereign people are not most intolerably infringed. If we are to believe their writings and assertions, almost literally repeated by a swarm of these Sophisters, "ignorance, "fear, chance, folly, superstition, and the imprudent gratitude of nations, have every where directed the establishment as well as the reformation of governments." These have been the sole origin of all societies, and of all empires which have existed until the present day. Such is the assertion of the *Social System* which the secret academy published as a Continuation of the

Social Contract of Jean Jaques ; such are the lessons taught in *the Essay on Prejudices*, which they gave to the public under the supposed name of Dumarfais ; such again is the doctrine of the *Oriental Despotism* which they attributed to Boulanger ; such in fine are the principles of the *System of Nature*, which Diderot, with the chosen of the elect, after having given it existence, so carefully seek to circulate \*.

Jean Jaques, teaching *that man is born free, and yet that he is every where in chains*, asks *how this happens*; and answers, that *he is ignorant* †. His disciples of the secret academy were become either more learned or more daring.

The most moderate of these Sophisters, or at least those who under the standard of the *Œconomist* Du Quesnay wished to appear so, did not give the people a more flattering account of the origin or of the present state of their governments. " It must be owned," they tell us by the insipid pen of Dupont, " that the generality of nations still  
" remain victims of an infinitude of crimes and  
" calamities, which could not have happened if a  
" well-conducted study on the law of nature, on  
" moral justice, and on real and true politics, had

\* See these works, particularly the *Social System*, Chap. 2 and 3, Vol. II.

† Chap. 1, Book I. *Social Contract*.

" enlight-

“ enlightened the majority of intellects. Here  
 “ prohibitions are extended even to thought ;  
 “ their nations misled by the ferocious love of  
 “ conquest, sacrifice the stock of which they stand  
 “ most in need for the cultivation of their lands,  
 “ to these plans of usurpation. Men are torn  
 “ from their half-inhabited deserts, and the scat-  
 “ tered riches which had been sparingly sown are  
 “ seized for the purpose of shedding the blood of  
 “ neighbouring states, and of multiplying else-  
 “ where other deserts. On one side . . . . on the  
 “ other . . . . Elsewhere . . . . Elsewhere . . . .”

This fable picture is terminated by twenty or  
 thirty lines of dots, leaving to the imagination of  
 the reader to fill them up, or to tell us, as the gen-  
 tle author will, “ *Such is still the state of the world ;*  
 “ *such has always been the state of our Europe, and*  
 “ *nearly of the whole globe \**.”

The reader will remark, that the men who  
 broach such doctrines on Governments, and wish  
 to instil them into the people, take care to insert  
 them in those works which are peculiarly devoted  
 to the instruction of country farmers. He will  
 also remark how exactly they follow the steps of  
 their master Jean Jaques. This latter, refusing to  
 except England from the general sentence, that

Particu-  
 larly  
 against  
 the Eng-  
 lish go-  
 vernment.

\* Ephemerides du Citoyen, Vol. VII. Operations de L'Eu-  
 rope.

*man was every where in chains*, did not hesitate at saying, "The people of England deceive themselves when they fancy they are free : they are so, in fact, only during the interval between a dissolution of one Parliament and the election of another ; for, as soon as a new one is elected, *they are again in chains and lose all their virtue as a people*. And thus, by the use they make of their few moments of liberty, they deserve to lose it \*."

Reflecting adepts would have questioned Jean Jaques to know how his equal and sovereign people could enjoy a greater degree of Liberty than the English, and how it came to pass that they were not as much enslaved every where else as they were in their assemblies, since it was only in these assemblies that the people *could exercise their sovereignty* ; and in these assemblies even their sovereignty was null, their acts were illegitimate and void unless they *had been convoked by the proper Magistrate* ; since on all other occasions the sole duty of this sovereign people was to obey † ? But our passive adepts preferred viewing the English Government in the light of one that was to be cried down with the rest. " Nations even that flatter themselves with being the best governed,

\* Social Contract, Chap. 15, Book III.

† Chap. 12 and 13, Book III.

" such

“ such as England, for example, *have no further*  
 “ *pleasure* but that of perpetually struggling against  
 “ the Sovereign Power, and of rendering their  
 “ natural imposts inadequate to the public expen-  
 “ diture.—Of seeing both their present and future  
 “ revenues, the fortunes and mansions of their  
 “ posterity, in short of half their island, sold and  
 “ alienated by their representatives, &c.—Eng-  
 “ land at this price, too dear by three fourths,  
 “ forms a Republic, in which, luckily for her, *a*  
 “ *couple of excellent laws* are to be found ; but as  
 “ to her constitution, notwithstanding all that  
 “ Montesquieu has said to the contrary, it does  
 “ not appear much to be envied \*.”

Our respect for that nation forbids us to conti-  
 nue our citations from this declamatory work.—  
 What we have already quoted will suffice to show  
 how much the Sophisters wished by means of  
 these scurrilous harangues to persuade all na-  
 tions, that, since the sovereignty of the people  
 was so strangely violated even in England, and if  
 it was necessary for her to overthrow her consti-  
 tution to re-establish the people in their rights,  
 how much greater must be the necessity of a Re-  
 volution for all other nations being their sole hope  
 of breaking their chains.

\* Dupont on the Republic of Geneva, Chap. IV.

Hatred of  
the Sophi-  
sters  
against all  
Kings.

Helvetius  
and many  
others.

This was only an indirect attack of the Sophisters against Kings, under whose Government most nations live. Nor must the reader expect to see Philosophism circumscribing its effects to render every throne odious, within the narrow sphere of commenting on the seditious parts of Montesquieu, Jean Jaques, or Voltaire.

Montesquieu had represented prejudice as the prime mover of Monarchies. He had declared that it was very difficult for *a people to be virtuous* under that form of Government. Helvetius, falling forth from his secret academy, and carrying these principles to greater lengths, exclaims, "The true *Monarchy* is no more than a Constitution invented *to corrupt the morals of nations and to enslave them*; witness the Romans when they gave a King or a Despot to the Spartans and Britons\*."

Jean Jaques had taught nations, that if *the authority of Kings* came from God, it was by the same channel through which *sickness* and other public scourges came †.—Raynal follows him to inform us, that "*these Kings are wild beasts who devour nations* ‡." A third Sophister presents himself who tells us, all "*your Kings are the*

\* Of man, note to Sect. 9, Vol. II.

† Emile, Vol. IV. and Social Contract,

‡ Philosophical and Political History, &c. Book XIX. Vol. IV,

" first



“ *first executioners of their subjects; and force and  
 “ stupidity were the founders of their thrones* \*.”—  
 Another tells us, “ Kings are like Saturn in the  
 “ Heathen Mythology, who devours his own  
 “ children;” others again say, “ the Monarchical  
 “ form of Government, placing such great force  
 “ in the hands of one man, must by its very na-  
 “ ture tempt him to abuse his power; and by  
 “ that means, placing himself above the laws, he  
 “ will exercise *Tyranny and Despotism*, which are  
 “ the *two greatest calamities that can befall a state* †.”  
 The most moderate of their declamations on Roy-  
 alty supposes *too great a distance between the Sove-  
 reign and the Subject* for it ever to be looked upon  
 as a wise Government ‡; and that if a King be  
 absolutely necessary, we never should forget, that  
 he only ought to be *the first Commissioner of the na-  
 tion* §.

But this necessity grieved the Sophisters to such  
 a degree, that, to make their countrymen triumph  
 over it, they incessantly repeat that France is under  
 the yoke of *Despotism, whose peculiar property is to  
 debase the mind and degrade the soul*; that their  
 country even, governed by Kings, can find no re-  
 medy for its *misfortunes* but in falling a prey to a

\* System of Reason.

† See Essay on Prejudice, the Oriental Despotism, and So-  
 cial System, Chap. 2 and 3. ‡ Ibid.

§ Helvetius on Man.

*foreign*

*foreign enemy*; that as long as they are swayd by the scepter of Kings, " they are *invincibly* and by " the *very form of government brought down to brutal* " *degradation*. That it is in vain to diffuse light " on *the French*, as it will only show them the " misfortunes of Despotism without enabling them " to withdraw from its oppression."

What they say to their countrymen they proclaim to all the nations of the earth. They have consecrated whole volumes to persuade them *that it is a pusillanimous fear alone that has created and* Raynal. *still maintains Kings on their thrones* \*. They proclaim to the English, the Spaniards, the Prussians, the Austrians, indiscriminately with the French, *that the people are as much slaves in Europe as they are in America*; that the only advantage *they enjoy over the Negroes is, that they may leave one chain to take another*. They proclaim that the *inequality of power* in any state whatever, and particularly the reunion of the supreme power in their chiefs, is *the height of folly*; that that spirit of *Liberty* and of *Independence* which cannot bear with a superior, much less with Kings and Sovereigns, *is the instinct of nature enlightened by reason*. They brandish that *parallel sword* which was to glide along the heads of

\* See the Oriental Despotism in particular.

Kings,

Kings, and mow off those which *rose above the horizontal plane* \*.

If nations, wise in experience, and despising the declamations of a seditious Philosophism, sought an asylum under the protection of a King, or if to crush anarchy they had extended the authority of the Monarch, it was then that one might behold the adepts exclaiming in their rage, “ at  
“ this humiliating sight (of a nation of the North,  
“ of Sweden, re-establishing the rights of its Monarch), who is there that does not ask himself,  
“ *what then is man?* What is that profound and  
“ original sense of dignity with which he is supposed to be endowed? Is he then born for independence or for slavery? What then is that  
“ silly flock, called a nation. Mean populace!  
“ silly flock! What, content to groan when you  
“ ought to roar? cowardly, stupid populace!  
“ since this perpetual oppression gives you no  
“ energy—since you are millions, and, nevertheless, suffer a dozen of children (called Kings)  
“ armed with little sticks (called Scepters) to lead  
“ you as they please; obey, but submit without  
“ importuning us with your complaints, and learn  
“ to be unhappy, if you don’t know how to be  
“ free †.”

\* See Philosophical and Political History, by Raynal, &c. Vol. III. and IV. *passim*.  
† Ibid.

Had

Had every nation murdered its Sovereign at the time when Philosophism broached such doctrine, what would they have done more than practise the lessons of the Sophisters? When we see that it was the very leaders of the sect who held such language, an Helvetius or a Boulanger, a Diderot or a Raynal; when we know that it was those very productions in which such sentiments were advanced that endeared them to the sect, what can we suppose was the meaning of this concert, of this union of the most celebrated adepts? What could be their plans? Where did they aim their blows, if not at the Throne as well as the Altar? Was it not against them that their rage was constantly let loose? What other Revolution did they meditate, if not that which buries the altar and the throne beneath the ruins of the state?

I know what is incumbent on History to add with respect to some of these Sophisters, to Raynal for example. I know that when this adept beheld the Revolution, he shuddered at the sight of its excesses, that he even shed tears; and that when he appeared at the bar of the new Legislators, he dared reproach them with having o'erstepped the limits which Philosophy had prescribed. But this apparition of Raynal at the bar, or rather this comic scene which had been vainly prepared by the humbled and jealous Revolutionists, in opposition to the Revolutionists triumphant in their successes, only furnishes us  
with

with a new proof of the plots of the Sophisters.— For it was in their name that Raynal dares address the new Legislators, saying, ‘That is not what we wished for; you have broken through the Revolutionary line which we had traced\*.’ What can such

\* Let the reader consult the discourse he pronounced at the bar of the National Assembly, and he will find that the whole drift of his speech turns on those two lines. I know that this Sophister at his retreat near Paris wept bitterly on the excesses of the Revolution, that he threw the fault principally on the French Calvinists, and cried out, “It is those wretches, “I see it clearly, it is those men for whom I have done so “much, that plunge us into all these horrid scenes.” These words were related to me by an Attorney-General of the Parliament of Grenoble on the very day he had heard them, and a few days before the famous 10th of August 1792. But what do such tears prove? Without doubt Raynal and his brotherhood did not wish for all those butcheries, the infamy of which he wishes to throw upon the Calvinists. But Rabaud de St. Etienne, Barnave, and the other Calvinists, whether deputies, actors, or leaders, were not the only men formed by his Philosophy. The masters wished for a Revolution after their fashion, but the disciples consummate it according to their own ideas. And by what right can those men who have formed the rebel, complain of the excesses, crimes, and atrocious deeds of his rebellion! Observe—We are told also, that in the end Raynal returned to his religion. He would be another great example to be added to La Harpe. If this be really the fact, if even those who have so greatly contributed to the Revolution by their impiety acknowledge that to return to that God they begun by deserting, is the only means of expiating their crime, how culpable is it in those who,  
after

such language mean, and are we not authorized to answer the man who holds it, 'These rebels do not follow the line which you and your sages had traced for the Revolution! There was then a Revolution which you and your sages had meditated and planned. Are the plans of Revolutions against Kings carried on without the plots of rebellion? Could those Revolutions which you planned differ from those which your lessons on Liberty and Equality prognosticated! or, when you brand every nation which suffers itself to be governed by its lawful King, or which *contents itself with groaning when it ought to roar* against its Sovereign, with the appellation of *a filthy flock of cowards*?— And when these nations begin to roar why should you complain? So far from having transgressed the bounds you had prescribed, our Legislative Jacobins have not yet attained the goal you had pointed out. The *parallel sword* has not yet glided over the heads of Kings; wait then till there shall not exist a single King upon earth; and even then, so far from having overshot your doctrines, Jacobinism will only have followed them to the very letter.'

after having fallen a sacrifice to that Revolution, expose even in exile their impiety to public view! How unfortunate is it for them to be at once the victim of the Jacobin and the scandal of the Christian!

To

To such an answer, which Raynal so richly deserved, the National Assembly might have added, ' Before you complain, begin by thanking us for the justice we have rendered you. One of our members \*, friendly to Philosophers like you, has represented to us the injustice of Kings whom you had set at defiance, he has shown us in your person the sacred liberty of Philosophy oppressed by Despotism. At the very name of Philosopher, we discovered our master, the worthy rival of Voltaire, D'Alembert, Jean Jaques, and of so many others, whose writings and concert hastened our successes. We have listened to the prayer of your friends, we have restored you to Liberty under the eye of that very King, whom you taught us to revile, go and peacefully enjoy the advantages of friendship, and of the decrees of the national assembly, while it will continue to run the course which you have marked out.'

Thus even the vain protestations of humiliated Philosophism, reduced to blush at the excesses naturally attendant on its doctrines, every thing in short concurs to demonstrate the existence of their Conspiracies.

But partial attacks of the adepts are not sufficient ; the reader must behold them encouraging each other, pressing the execution of their plots,

\* The honour of Raynal's recall was attributed to Mr. Malouet.

and

and the insurrection of the people against their Sovereigns. Let him hear the same Raynal convoking the adepts, and calling out to them,  
 “ Sages of the earth, *Philosophers of ALL NATIONS*,  
 “ make those mercenary slaves blush who are always ready to exterminate their fellow-citizens  
 “ at the command of their masters. Make nature and humanity rise in their souls against  
 “ such a perversion of the social laws. Learn that  
 “ *liberty is the gift of God*, but *authority the invention of man*. Bare to the light *those mysteries*  
 “ *which encompass the universe with chains and*  
 “ *darkness*; and may the people, learning how  
 “ much their credulity has been imposed upon,  
 “ *avenge the glory of the human species \**,”

The art and solicitude with which the Sophisters seek to preclude Kings from the succour they might one day have drawn from the fidelity of their troops, is worthy of attention. We see in these discourses by what means the French army first imbibed those principles which have been so often and so successfully employed by the revolutionists to restrain and damp their courage and their activity. We see how they succeeded in representing as rebels so many of their brethren, against whom humanity, nature, and the social laws, forbade them to turn their arms, though it

• Ibid. Vol. I.

were



were to defend the life and authority of their lawful Sovereign. We see these Sophisters bearing down all opposition, and preparing a free course for all the fury of that horde of rebels or of pretended patriots, that they might brandish, without fear, the hatchet and the pike. The reader may observe them disposing the armies meanly to betray their Sovereigns under the pretence of fraternizing with rebels and assassins.

To these villanous precautions, which destroyed in the rebels the fear of the Royal forces, let us add the pains they took to rob Kings of what support religion and Heaven itself might have given them, that affectation of extinguishing all remorse in rebellion, and of pointing out the God who protects Kings as an object of detestation. How could it be possible for us to mistake the double tendency of doctrines at once dictated by the phrenzy of rebellion and of impiety !

“ It is only in a numerous, fixed, and civilized  
 “ state of society, that, wants daily multiplying,  
 “ and interests differing, Governments have been  
 “ obliged to have recourse to laws, public forms  
 “ of worship, and uniform systems of religion.  
 “ It is then that the governors of the people in-  
 “ voke that *fear of invisible powers, to restrain*  
 “ *them, to render them docile, and to oblige them to*  
 “ *live in peace.* It is thus that morality and policy  
 “ form a part of the religious system. *Chiefs of*  
 Vol. II. N “ *nations,*

Diderot's  
doctrines  
on Kings.

“ *nations*, often superstitious themselves, little ac-  
 “ quainted with their own interests, or versed in  
 “ sound morality, and blind to the real agents,  
 “ believe they secure their own authority as well  
 “ as the happiness and peace of society at large,  
 “ by immersing their subjects in superstition, by  
 “ threatening them with their invisible phantoms  
 “ (of their divinity) and by treating them like  
 “ children, who are quieted by means of fables  
 “ and chimeras. Under the shadow of such sur-  
 “ prizing inventions, and of which the chiefs  
 “ themselves are often dupes, transmitting them  
 “ from generation to generation, Sovereigns be-  
 “ lieve themselves excused from seeking any far-  
 “ ther instruction. They neglect the laws, they  
 “ enervate themselves in luxury, and are slaves to  
 “ their caprices. They confide in the gods for  
 “ the government of their people. They deliver  
 “ over the instruction of their subjects to priests  
 “ who are to render them very devout and sub-  
 “ missive, and teach them from their earliest  
 “ youth to tremble both before the visible and in-  
 “ visible gods.

“ It is thus that nations are kept in a perpetual  
 “ awe by their governors, and are only restrained  
 “ by vain chimeras. When the happiness of man  
 “ shall become the object of real investigation, it  
 “ will be with *the gods of heaven* that the reform  
 “ must begin. *No good system of government can*  
 “ be

" *be founded on a despotic god; he will always make  
" tyrants of his representatives."*

Is it possible to combine their attacks in a more villanous manner against the God of heaven and the powers of the earth? Tyrants or Kings have invented a god, and this god and his priests support alone the authority of these Kings and Tyrants. This perfidious assertion is perpetually repeated throughout the famous System of Nature, and this is the work which the secret academy disseminates with the greatest profusion. But neither Diderot nor his associates will hesitate at going to much greater lengths, notwithstanding the height to which they had carried their hatred in this famous system. If we are to believe them, all the vices and crimes of Tyrants, the oppression and misfortunes of the People, all originate in the attributes of the justice of the God of the Gospel. That God of *vengeance*, so terrible to the wicked; that God, the *remunerator*, the consolation, and the hope of the just man, is in the eyes of the Sophister *no more than a chimerical and capricious being, solely useful to Kings and Priests*. It is because Priests are perpetually stunning both Kings and People with this God of *vengeance* and *remuneration* that Priests are wicked, Kings despotic and tyrannic, in short the people oppressed. It is on that account, we see that *Princes even the most abjectly superstitious are no more than robbers; too proud*

*to be humane, too great to be just; and who are inventing for their own use a particular code of perfidy, violence, and treachery. It is on this account, that nations, degraded by superstition, will suffer children, or Kings made giddy with flattery, to govern them with an iron rod. With this God of vengeance and remuneration, these children, or foolish kings transformed into gods, are masters of the law. It lies in their breast to decide what is just or unjust. With this God their licentiousness has no bounds, because they are certain of impunity—Accustomed to no other fear but that of God, they act as if they had nothing to fear. This God of vengeance and remuneration is the cause why history swarms with wicked and vicious potentates \*.*

In transcribing these short extracts, we have abridged prolix chapters tending to infuse that hatred for God and kings into the minds of the people, which animated the leading adepts. Nobody could better express to what degree he was inflamed by it than Diderot himself. We have seen Voltaire, in a moment of phrensy, wishing to see the last Jesuit strangled with the entrails of the last Janseuist. The same frantic rage had inspired Diderot with the same idea on Priests and Kings; and it was well known in Paris, that in his fits of rage he would exclaim, Ah! *when then*

\* Ibid. Vol. II. Chap. 8.

*shall*

*shall I see the last King strangled with the bowels of the last Priest \*!*

The reader may be surprized at hearing that the System of Nature was not the most virulent production which the Club of Holbach had published to incite the people to rebellion and to persuade them to consider their Kings and Princes in no other light than as monsters to be crushed. The adept or adepts who had composed the *Social System* availed themselves of the impression Diderot's work had made. They are more reserved on Atheism, only to be more virulent against Kings. The object of this work is to persuade the people that they are the victims of a long state of warfare, which ended by throwing them under the yoke of Kings. But they were not to abandon all hope of breaking their chains, and even of loading their Kings with them, though they had been hitherto unsuccessful. There the imagination is worked upon, and the meanest subject is taught to say to his Sovereign, "We have proved the weakest, we have submitted to force; but should we ever become the strongest, we

Inflam-  
matory doc-  
trines of  
other  
adepts.

\* It is with regret that I recollect having been credibly informed, that in the north of Ireland the disaffected part of the inhabitants frequently gave as a toast, *May the guts of the last Bishop serve as a rope to strangle the last King*. If this be true, the reader will not be at a loss to know whence they imbibed their principles. T.

N 3

" would

" *would wrest that usurped power from you when-*  
 " *ever you exercised it for our unhappiness. It*  
 " *is only by your attention to our prosperity that*  
 " *you can make us forget the infamous titles by*  
 " *which you reign over us. If we are not strong*  
 " *enough to shake off the yoke we will only bear it*  
 " *with horror. You shall find an enemy in each*  
 " *of your slaves, and every instant you shall trem-*  
 " *ble on the thrones which you have unlawfully*  
 " *usurped \*.*"

Such menaces will certainly be looked upon as the last stage of their conspiring fury. Nevertheless they found a higher tone ; and, to teach nations to shudder at the very name of Monarchy, they roar like monsters.

Many years before the French Revolution their productions had teemed with every thing that a Petion, a Condorcet, or a Marat could have invented in their frantic rage against Sovereigns to excite the populace to bring the head of the unfortunate Lewis XVI. to the scaffold ; since many years after having told us, *that truth and not politeness should be the chief object of man*, to practise this doctrine they address Kings, saying, " *Ye tigers, deified by other tigers, you expect to pass to immortality ? Yes, answer they, but as objects of execration †.*"

\* Social System, Chap. I. Vol. II.

† Ibid. note.

With

With the same excess of phrensy, commenting  
on the axiom,

Some lucky soldier was the first of Kings,

full of his Voltaire, like the Pythoness inspired  
by the devil, from the summit of his fiery tripod  
the same adept, addressing himself to all nations,  
tells them, "Thousands of executioners crowned  
" with laurel and wreaths of flowers, returning  
" from their expeditions, carry about in triumph  
" an *idol* which they call *King*, Emperor, So-  
" vereign. They crown this idol and prostrate  
" themselves before it, and then, at the sound of  
" instruments, and of repeated, senseless and bar-  
" barous acclamations, they declare it in future  
" to be the *Sovereign Director* of all the bloody  
" scenes which are to take place in the realm,  
" and to be *the first executioner of the nation.*"

Then, swelling his chest, foaming at the mouth,  
and with haggard eyes he makes the air resound  
with the following frightful utterance ;

" *To the pretended masters of the earth*, scourges  
" of mankind, illustrious tyrants of your equals,  
" *Kings, Princes, Monarchs, Chiefs, Sovereigns*, all  
" you, in fine, who, raising yourselves on the  
" throne, *and above your equals*, have lost all *ideas*  
" *of equality*, equity, *sociability* and truth ; in whom  
" *sociability* and goodness, the beginnings of the  
" most common virtues, have not even shown  
N 4 " themselves,

“ themselves, I cite you all at the tribunal of  
 “ reason. If this miserable globe, silently moving  
 “ through the etherial space, drags away with it  
 “ millions of unhappy beings fixed to its surface,  
 “ and fettered with the bonds of opinion; if this  
 “ globe, I say, has been a prey to you, and if  
 “ you still continue to devour this sad inheritance,  
 “ it is not to the wisdom of your predecessors, nor  
 “ to the virtues of the first inhabitants, that you  
 “ are indebted for it; but *to stupidity, to fear, to*  
 “ *barbarity, to perfidy, to superstition. Such are your*  
 “ *titles.* I am not the person who pronounces  
 “ against you; it is the oracle of ages, it is the  
 “ annals of history which depose against you.  
 “ Open them, they will assuredly furnish you with  
 “ better information, and the numerous monu-  
 “ ments of our miseries and of our errors will be  
 “ proofs which neither political pride nor fana-  
 “ ticism can controvert.

“ Descend from your thrones, and, laying aside  
 “ both sceptre and crown, go and question the  
 “ lowest of your subjects; ask him what *he really*  
 “ *loves, and what he hates the most:* he will un-  
 “ doubtedly answer, that he really *loves but his*  
 “ *equals, and that he hates his masters* \*.”

It is thus that, assuming every tone from that of the epigram, pamphlet, romance, system, or tragic

\* Social System, page 7 and 8.

sentence,



sentence, to the declamations of enthusiasm, or the roaring of rage, Voltaire's and Montesquieu's school, so well described by Condorcet, had succeeded in inundating all France and all Europe with works naturally tending to efface from the earth the very memory of a King. <sup>Consequences of these doctrines and their concert.</sup>

To place in their true light the intention and the concert of the Sophisters, the Historian must never lose sight of the den from whence these productions were issued, and of the art with which and the men by whom they were spread from the palace to the cottage; By the Secret Society of the Hotel D'Holbach, in Paris; by the numerous editions in the provincial towns; by the hawkers in the country; by D'Alembert's office of instruction, and tutors, in wealthy families; and by the country school-masters in the villages, and among the workmen and day-labourers\*. In their various attacks, let him remark the uniformity of their principles, of their sentiments, and of their hatred; and let him particularly remember, that the same authors who declaim most virulently against Kings, had already distinguished themselves by their hatred against religion. Should he hesitate at declaring the Sophisters of impiety to be also the Sophisters of rebellion; should the very evidence of the conspiracy lead him to doubt of its

\* See Vol. I. Chap. XVI.

reality;

reality; in that case let us not refuse to solve even the doubts of the historian, and may the very objections be turned into fresh demonstrations!

New  
proofs  
drawn  
from the  
objec-  
tions.

I feel that it may be objected to me, that my proofs differ in their nature from those which I had chiefly drawn from the very correspondence of the *Conspirators*. In answer, it may be remarked, that if any cause of surprize existed, it would not be, that the letters of the *Conspirators* made public should contain nothing respecting the conspiracy against *Kings*; but it would be, on the contrary, that they had furnished us with so much evidence. We may be surprized at the assurance of the editors of those letters, who show us Voltaire conjuring D'Alembert not to betray his secret on *Kings*, who show us Voltaire panting after Republics; Voltaire bewailing the departure of those adepts who were expounding the new catechism of Republican Liberty in Paris itself; Voltaire praised by D'Alembert for the art he displays in combating *Kings* or pretended Despots, and in preparing Revolutions and their boisterous scenes; Voltaire, in fine, regretting that they were still too distant for him to flatter himself with living to see them. It is this same correspondence which points out D'Alembert furious at his *hands being tied*, and at not being able to deal the same blows on the pretended Despots as Voltaire did, but seconding him at least with his wishes in this rebellious warfare. When all these letters

letters were made public by Condorcet and the other editors in 1785, Lewis XVI. was still on the throne, and the Revolution at some distance. They had reason to fear the discovery of their plots; and it is easy to see, that many of the letters had been suppressed. Most certainly Condorcet, and the other adepts, must have had even then a strange confidence in their success, not to have suppressed many more. Besides, had these letters been entirely silent as to the Conspiracy against Kings, could even that silence invalidate the avowals of Condorcet, and of so many other adepts? The same artifices, the same calumnies, the same wishes against the Throne being combined with those against the Altar, in the productions of the sect, could that silence weaken the evidence of the common plot for the destruction of both?

But if these plots were so visible, it will be said, are not the Magistrates to be blamed for their negligence and silence? How was it possible that these Conspirators could have escaped the severity of the laws? Here it would be sufficient to recall the favorite maxim of the Conspirators, *Strike, but bide your hand!* It would suffice, were we merely to repeat Condorcet's words when, after having exposed in the clearest terms, the double conspiracy, the labors, and the concert of the Philosophers against the Altar and the Throne, he adds,

Conspiracy denounced by the Magistrates.

adds, that "the *Chiefs* of the Philosophers *always* " *bad the art of escaping vengeance, though they ex-* " *posed themselves to hatred; and of escaping perse-* " *cution, though sufficiently conspicuous to suffer no* " *diminution of their glory\*.*" But this silence of the Magistracy is a false imputation. The Conspirators may have concealed themselves from the tribunals, but the Conspiracy was not on that account less evident to the sight of the Magistracy; and juridical denunciations will give new force to our demonstrations. If such proofs are necessary for the Historian, let us transcribe the words of a most celebrated magistrate; let us hearken to Mr. Seguier, Attorney-General of the Parliament of Paris, denouncing on the 18th of August 1770 this very Conspiracy of the Philosophers.

" Since the extirpation of heresies which have " disturbed the peace of the church," said the eloquent Magistrate, " we have seen a system " rising out of darkness, far more dangerous in " its consequences than those ancient errors, al- " ways crushed as fast as they appeared. *An im-* " *pious and daring sect has raised its head in the* " *midst of us, and it has decorated its false wisdom* " *with the name of Philosophy.* Under this autho- " ritative title its disciples pretend to all know-

\* Above, Page 135.

" ledge.

ledge. Its sectaries have taken upon themselves  
 to be the instructors of mankind. *Liberty in*  
*thinking* is their cry, and this cry has resound-  
 ed from the northern to the southern pole.  
*With one hand they have sought to shake the Throne,*  
*and with the other to overturn the Altar.* Their  
 object is to abolish all belief, and to instil new  
 ideas into the mind of man on *civil and religious*  
*institutions*; and this revolution may be said to  
 have taken place; the proselytes of the sect have  
 multiplied, and their maxims are spread far and  
 wide. *Kingdoms have felt their ancient basis*  
*totter*; and nations, surprized to find their prin-  
 ciples annihilated, have asked each other, by  
 what strange fatality they became so different  
 from themselves.

Those who by their talents should have en-  
 lightened their cotemporaries, have become the  
 leaders of these unbelievers; they have hoisted  
 the banner of revolt, and have thought to add  
 to their celebrity by this spirit of independence;  
 numberless obscure scribblers, unable to attain  
 to celebrity by their abilities, have had the same  
 presumption. In fine, religion can number  
 nearly as many declared enemies, as literature  
 can boast of pretended Philosophers. *And Go-*  
*vernment should tremble* at tolerating in its bosom  
 such an inflammatory sect of unbelievers, whose  
 sole

" sole object appears to be to *stir up the people to rebellion, under pretence of enlightening them* \*."

This formal denunciation of the double Conspiracy of the Sophisters was grounded on the peculiar attention which they paid to the propagation of their impious and regicide principles in their daily productions, and more particularly in those which this great lawyer presented to the Court as most deserving of animadversion.

Foremost among those productions stood a work of Voltaire's, the honorary president of Holbach's club. It was one of the most impious of all, and bore the title of "*God and Men*." The second, *Christianity Unvelled*, had been written by Damiaville, a zealous adept of that club. The third, the pretended *Critical Examination*, was published by this same club under the name of Freret, as the repenting Secretary *Le Roi* declared. The fourth was the famous *System of Nature* written by Diderot, and two others of this secret academy.— So true it is, that most of that pestilential blight both of Impiety and Rebellion which has overspread the greatest part of Europe, proceeded from that den of Conspirators †.

\* Suit of the 18th August 1770.

† There were also some few books translated from the English: But such only as are cast aside with abhorrence in England for their impiety; that however was the greatest of all recommendations with Voltaire and the club.

" From

“ From these different productions,” continued the Magistrate, “ a system of the most flagitious doctrine may be collected, which *invincibly proves*, that their proposed object is not to destroy the Christian Religion only—Impiety has not limited its plans of innovation solely to its dominion over the minds of men. *Its restless and enterprizing genius, averse to all dependence, aspires at the overbrow of every political institution, and its wishes will only then be fulfilled when it shall have thrown the Legislative and Executive Powers into the hands of the People, when it shall have destroyed the necessary inequality of ranks and stations, when it shall have reviled the Majesty of Kings, and have rendered their authority precarious and dependent on the caprice of a blind multitude; when, in fine, by these astonishing changes, it shall have immersed the whole world in the horrors of Anarchy with all its concomitant evils.*”

To these denunciations of the public Magistrate may be added those of the general assemblies of the Clergy, those of a great many Bishops in their pastoral letters, those, in short, of the Sorbonne and of every religious orator or author, who never ceased refuting the Sophisters of the day, whether in their theses, their writings, or from the pulpit. It would be vain to say, that these denunciations were only made by people seeking to strengthen their own cause by confounding it with that

that of Kings. But are we not to hearken to an adversary even, when he speaks for us as well as for himself, and when he produces proofs. It would be imprudence in the extreme not to hearken, and even second him, when he comes and says, ' You are leagued with my greatest enemies, but they are equally yours ; I forewarn you of their hostile intentions ; and if they have conspired against me, it is only to ascertain the success of the plots they have formed against you \*.' It would have been easy to discriminate, whether the Clergy denouncing these conspiracies were actuated by self-interest or the love of truth ; a slight examination of the proofs adduced in testimony of their denunciations would have sufficed. These proofs were all drawn from the productions of the sect, from productions replete with sarcastic declamation and calumny against Sovereigns, with invitations to the people to rebellion, sowing in the same page the seeds of Anarchy with those of Impiety. And these were evidently the two-fold productions of the same men, of the same academy of authors, of the same conspirators. Were not the Clergy then authorized to point out these same Sophisters as brandishing the torch, on one side to

\* See the acts of the Assemblies of the Clergy, 1770. The pastoral letters of Mr. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris. The sermons of Pere Neuville, the works of the Abbé Bergier and of many others.

spread



spread the blaze throughout the temple, on the other to kindle the flames which were to reduce the royal crown and sceptre to ashes \*? Might they not be said to have conspired more desperately against the throne than against the altar, and might not the latter conspiracy have been merely a preparatory step to the completion of the former? So far then from excluding the destruction of the Throne from their wishes, and confining them to the overthrow of Religion, say that to overturn Government was their chief object: Examine and compare their doctrines, behold their concert, their constancy, their assurance, and then candidly pronounce.

But the evidence of the Clergy shall, if it be required, be thrown aside as suspicious, though it is now too late to attain it with falsehood. Will the testimony of a man who certainly had every reason to spare the sect be also thrown aside? I have heard it asked, How it was possible, since the Sophisters were said to have conspired against the throne, that Frederic II. the Royal Sophister, could have been deceived by and could have leagued during so long a time with the sworn ene-

Testimony of the King of Prussia.

\* The burning of the crown and sceptre, with the other attributes of sovereignty, has been one of the favourite ceremonies of the Revolutionary Agents. In France the crown and sceptre, at Venice and Genoa the chair and golden book were burnt. T.

VOL. II.

O

mies

mies of his throne, in short with the Sophisters of Rebellion? But such an objection will only serve to throw new light on the Conspiracy. Let the Royal Sophister be the accuser, let him cover his Sophistical Masters with ridicule. The inveteracy of his hatred against religion, his protection of the irreligious Encyclopedists, all his conduct in short, will corroborate his testimony when he paints these Sophisters as empty sages conspiring equally against the altar and the throne. And the time came when Frederic II. perceived that his dear Philosophers, by initiating him into their mysteries of Impiety, had let him into but half their secret; that by employing his power to crush Christ, they had planned the destruction of his throne and the extirpation of Monarchy. Frederic was not the repenting adept, like the unhappy Le Roi, for his soul was too deeply immersed in impiety; but he was certainly ashamed of having been so strangely duped. Indignation and revenge succeed his admiration, and he blushes at having been so intimate with men who had made him their tool to undermine that power which he was most jealous of preserving.

He became the public accuser of those very Encyclopedists who owed the greatest part of their success to his protection. He warned Kings, that the grand object of those Sophisters was to deliver them over to the multitude, and to teach nations

*that*

*that subjects may exercise the right of deposing their Sovereign when they are displeased with him* \*. He gives notice to the Kings of France, that their Conspiracy is more particularly aimed at them.

The denunciation is clearly and formally expressed in the following terms : “ *The Encyclopedists reform all Governments. France (according to their plans) is to form a great Republic, and a Mathematician is to be its Legislator.—Mathematicians will govern it, and work all the operations of the new Republic by fluxions.—This Republic is to live in perpetual peace, and support itself without an army.* ”

This ironic and sarcastic style was by no means in Frederic's natural disposition. The repute of the pretended wisdom of the Sophisters had given weight to the adepts, and contributed to the seduction of the people; and contempt was the most powerful weapon that could be employed against them. It is on this account that he represents these pretended sages as puffed up with their own merits and their ridiculous pride. But whatever may be his style, it is to guard Kings and Nations against their plots that he writes. “ *The Encyclopedists,* ” says he, “ *are a set of pretended Philosophers who have lately started into existence. They look upon themselves as superior to*

\* See Refutation of the System of Nature by the King of Prussia.

“ every school which antiquity has produced.  
 “ *To the effrontery of the Cynic* they add the *impu-*  
 “ *dence* of uttering every paradox their brain can  
 “ invent. They are a set of *presumptuous* men,  
 “ who never will own themselves to be in the  
 “ wrong. According to their principles, the *sage*  
 “ can never be mistaken, he is the only en-  
 “ lightened person: It is from him that the light  
 “ emanates which is to dissipate the dreary dark-  
 “ ness into which the silly and blind multitude  
 “ have been deluded. And God knows how they  
 “ enlighten them. At one time it is by unfold-  
 “ ing the *origin of Prejudices*, at another, it is by  
 “ a book *on the Mind*, or a *System of Nature*; in  
 “ short, there is no end to them. A set of  
 “ *puppies*, whether from fashion or an air they  
 “ assume, call themselves their disciples. They  
 “ affect to copy them, and take upon themselves  
 “ to be the Deputy Governors of Mankind!”

While painting in such colours the pretensions  
 and ridiculous pride of both Masters and Scholars,  
 Frederic declares that *the madhouse* would be their  
 most proper habitation, *where they might legislate*  
*over their crazy equals*; or else, to show the igno-  
 rance of their systems, and what innumerable dif-  
 ficulties they would engender, he wishes “ that some  
 “ province which deserved a *severe punishment*  
 “ should be delivered over to them. Then they  
 “ would learn, says he, by experience, after having  
 “ thrown

“ thrown every thing topsy turvy, that they were  
 “ a set of ignorant fellows ; they would learn that  
 “ to criticize is easy, but that the art of criticism  
 “ is difficult ; and above all, that no one is so apt  
 “ to talk nonsense as he that meddles with what he  
 “ does not understand\*.”

Frederic, in support of regal authority, would sometimes lay aside his epigrammatic style and think it incumbent on him to condescend to the refutation of the gross calumnies which his Sophistical Masters had invented against the throne. It is thus that we see him refuting the System of Nature and the *Essay on Prejudice*, which latter the secret academy had published under the name of Dumarfais. There he principally devotes himself to exposing the cunning of the Sophisters ; he shows with what wicked art the Conspirators, calumniating the Sovereigns and the Pontiffs, only seek to instigate the hatred of all nations against them. Among others we may distinguish the author of the System of Nature, who in an especial manner has undertaken to disparage all Sovereigns. “ *I can venture to assert,*” he says, “ *that*  
 “ *the Clergy have never spoken to Princes all that*  
 “ *nonsense which the author pretends. If ever*  
 “ *they may have represented Kings as the images*  
 “ *of the Deity, it was doubtless only in an hyper-*

\* See Refutation of the System of Nature, by the King of Prussia:

“ bolical sense, to guard them by the comparison  
 “ against any abuse of their authority, and to  
 “ warn them to be just and beneficent, that they  
 “ may imitate the general attributes given to the  
 “ Deity by all nations. The author has dreamed,  
 “ that treaties have been made between the Sove-  
 “ reign and the Ecclesiastic, in which Princes  
 “ had agreed to honour and sanction the power  
 “ of the Clergy provided the latter preached sub-  
 “ mission to the people. I will venture to affirm,  
 “ that this is a shallow invention, and that nothing  
 “ could be more ridiculous or void of foundation,  
 “ than the supposition of such a fact \*.”

Though Frederic expresses himself thus on the  
 Ecclesiastics, still the reader is not to suppose him  
 more favourable to their cause. On the contrary,  
 his Antichristian prejudices blind him to such a  
 degree, that he does not so much blame the So-  
 phisters for attacking Religion, as for having done  
 it unskilfully; he even points out the weapons  
 with which he wishes it had been assailed. But  
 the more inveterate his hatred against Christianity,  
 the more demonstrative are the proofs he alleges  
 against those from whom he had imbibed it, and  
 of their plots against the throne. He pardons  
 their attack upon the altar, he even supports their  
 advances, but he defends the throne. At length

\* See Refutation of the System of Nature, by the King of  
 Prussia.

however

however he discovered and was convinced, that from the Conspiracy against the Altar the Sophisters passed to that against the Throne. It is this latter Conspiracy which he wishes to lay open; and it is with these latter plots that he charges the whole school in the person of Diderot, when he says, "The true sentiments of the Author, on Governments, are only to be discovered toward the end of his work. It is there that he lays down as a principle that subjects ought to enjoy *the right of deposing their Sovereigns* when displeased with them. And it is *to effectuate this* that he is perpetually crying out against great armies, which would prove too powerful an obstacle to his designs. A person would be tempted to think, it was Fontaine's fable of the Wolf and the Shepherd that he was reading. If ever the visionary ideas of our Philosophers could be realized, it would *be necessary to new-mould every Government in Europe*, which would be a mere trifle. It would be necessary again, though perhaps impossible, that *subjects setting up as the judges of their masters* should be wise and equitable; that those who aspired to the crown should be free from ambition; and that neither intrigue, cabal, nor the spirit of independence should prevail\*."

\* See Refutation of the System of Nature, by the King of Prussia.

O 4

Nothing

Nothing could have been more masterly applied in these observations than the comparison of the Wolf and the Shepherd. Frederic perfectly comprehended that the object of these declamatory repetitions of the sect against the vain-glory of war, was not so much to instil the love of peace into the minds of the Sovereign, as to deprive him of the necessary forces to repress that rebellious spirit which Philosophism sought to infuse into the people. He overlooked all those common truths on the miseries of war, which the Sophisters described, as if solely capable of describing them; but when he clearly perceived their plots, the hatred he conceived for the sect made him dedicate his talents to counteract the Philosophists in his own states, and to render them elsewhere as contemptible as he judged them dangerous.

It was then, that he composed *those Dialogues of the Dead*, between Prince Eugene, the Duke of Marlborough and the Prince of Lichtenstein, in which he particularly develops the ignorance of the *Encyclopedists*; their absurd pretension of governing the universe after their own new-fangled doctrines; and, above all, their plan for abolishing the Monarchical form of Government, and of beginning by the subversion of the throne of Bourbon to transform France into a Republic.

At that period it was in vain for Voltaire or D'Alembert to solicit his protection for any of the adepts.



adepts. Frederic would answer in a *dry and laconic style*, 'Let the scribblers of the sect go and seek a refuge in Holland, *where they may follow the same trade with so many of their equals.*' His indignation and contempt was expressed in such strong terms, that D'Alembert often thought it necessary to soften the expressions in his correspondence with Voltaire \*.

Then it was that D'Alembert perceived the *great mistake* which Philosophism had committed in reuniting the Civil and Ecclesiastical power against them. It was then that Diderot and his co-operators in *the System of Nature* were nothing more than a set of *blunderbeads*. Then it was that Frederic lost his title of *Solomon of the North*, and D'Alembert depicts him as a *peevish man*, or as a sick person whom the Philosophers might accost as Chatillon does Nerestan :

My Lord, if thus it is, your favour's vain.

" Besides, he says, Mr. Delisle (the adept who  
 " was recommended and so ill received) might  
 " not have been happy in the place we wished to  
 " procure for him (to attend on the King of  
 " Prussia). *You know as well as I do what a*  
 " *master he would have had to do with †.*" As to

\* Letter of D'Alembert to Voltaire, 27th December 1777.

† Letter 24th January 1778.

Voltaire,

Voltaire, who was equally in disgrace, he consoles himself by writing to D'Alembert, "What  
" can we do, my dear friend; we must take Kings  
" as they are and God too \*."

It is worthy of remark, that neither D'Alembert nor Voltaire seek to deceive Frederic as to the double Conspiracy which he attributed to their school. Silence, it is to be supposed, was judged the most prudent; and it really was so for men sensible that Frederic might bring further proofs, which would only expose their plots in a clearer light, and that before they could exult in their completion.

However numerous the proofs may be that we have already adduced of the Conspiracy against the Throne, whatever evidence may result from the wishes and the secret correspondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, whatever may be the combination of the Systems adopted by the sect, on one side throwing the authority of the laws into the hands of the people to constitute the Monarch the Slave of the multitude; on the other erasing the very name of King from the governments of the earth; however incontestable the object of those writings, all, or nearly all, issued from the secret academy of the Sophisters may

\* Letter, 4th January 1778.

be,

be \*, all breathing hatred to Kings and annihilation to the Throne as well as to the Altar ; whatever may be the force which the declarations of the penitent adepts, or of the accomplices exulting in their successes, may add to our demonstrations ; however authentic the evidence of the public tribunals may be, denouncing to the whole universe the Conspiracy of the Sophisters against Monarchy : In short, however aggravating the indignation and denunciations of the royal adept against his former masters of impiety (reduced as he is to tear off their mask, to preserve his own throne) may be for the conspiring Sophisters,

• After such a variety of proofs, and the declaration of the adept *Le Roi* respecting the hiding-place of the Sophisters at the Hotel d'Holbach, it would be useless for us to seek any further testimonies. Nevertheless, we think it incumbent on us to say, that since the publication of the first volume we have met with several people, who without being acquainted with all the particulars that we have given, knew the chief object of that meeting to have been the contriving and forwarding of the double conspiracy. I met with an English Gentleman in particular, who heard the academician *Dufaûx* positively assert, that the major part of those books, which have operated so great a change in the minds of the people with respect to Monarchy and Religion, had been composed in that club of the Hotel d'Holbach. And certainly the testimony of Mr. *Dufaûx*, a man so intimately connected with the Sophistical Authors of the Revolution, is as much to be depended upon at least as that of the repentant or exulting adepts of the sect,

still

still these are only the beginning of the proofs which the Historian may hereafter collect from our Memoirs. We still have many gradations of the conspiracy to investigate, and each step will add new force to our demonstrations.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. VI.

*Fifth Step of the Conspiracy against Kings.**The Democratic Essay at Geneva.*

AT the very time when Frederic II. was denouncing this impious sect (which he had heretofore protected with so much tenderness) as inimical to all authorities, he was far from being acquainted with the real depth of their plans. It is chiefly to Voltaire that we see him complain of the temerity of those philosophers against whom he was obliged to defend his Throne\*; and that at a time when Voltaire and the other Encyclopedian adepts, more particularly the Œconomists, were making the first essay that ever was made of the systems of the sect.

Geneva, that town where none but a few *beggarly fellows* believed in Christianity †, had been chosen for this first essay. The democracy which Calvin had established in that Republic was not in unison with their new rights of man. They held the people subdivided into different classes.

\* Letter to Voltaire, 7th July 1770, and Correspondence of Voltaire and D'Alembert, 1770. † 1st Part. Page 32.

The

The first class was that of citizens or burghesses, and comprehended the descendants of the ancient Genevese, or those received into this class, and it was from among them alone, that the councils and other officers of the Republic were chosen. They particularly had their vote in the general council. Three other classes had been formed of those who were more recently annexed to the Republic, or who had never been incorporated into the class of citizens. These were the natives, the mere inhabitants of the town, and the subjects. All these could, under the protection of the Republic, with very few exceptions, follow their divers trades and professions, acquire and cultivate lands, &c. but were excluded from the councils and principal dignities of the Republic.

However odious such distinctions may have appeared to the Sophisters, nevertheless the man who appeals to sound judgment and real principles will easily agree, that a Republic, or any State enjoying Sovereignty, has a right to admit new inhabitants on certain conditions which may be just and oftentimes necessary, without establishing on that account a perfect equality between the real and the adoptive children of the State. He who asks to be admitted knows the conditions of his admission, and the exceptions he is exposed to. He was perfectly free to accept, to refuse, or to seek an asylum elsewhere ; but certainly, having  
once

once accepted and admitted of these exceptions, he has no further right to create disturbances in the Republic, on pretence that, all men being equal, the adoptive child is entitled to the same privileges as the ancient children of the State.

But such self-evident principles were not consonant with those of the sect. Even Voltaire had laid them aside. From the perpetual repetition of his Liberty and Equality applied to religion, he had adopted the same doctrine with respect to politics. At the distance of six miles he had long since been observing the feuds which had arisen between the citizens and the magistrates, and thought that by working a political revolution there, he might add new laurels to those which he had gained by the religious revolution in which he so much gloried.

Hitherto these disputes between the magistrates and the citizens had been confined to the interpretation of certain laws, and of the constitution. The natives, and other classes who were excluded from the legislative power, were only spectators of the quarrel, when Voltaire and the other Sophists judged this a favourable moment to change the very constitution of the Republic, and to make an essay of their new Systems of Liberty and Equality, of the Legislative and Sovereign people.

All Europe is acquainted with the troubles which agitated Geneva from the year 1770 till 1782.

The

Parts  
acted by  
Voltaire  
and the  
other  
Sophis-  
ters.

The public prints were filled with accounts of the disordered state into which the constitution of Geneva had been thrown ; but the public prints have been entirely silent as to the part which the Sophisters took in it, and which it will be the particular object of our Memoirs to reveal. We shall lay open those intrigues and secret artifices, by which they hoped to establish an absolute Democracy according to the system of Jean Jaques Rousseau.

To form a sound judgment on these occult dealings, let men be questioned who, present on the spot, were capable of observing, and who acted the part of real citizens. Such has been the plan that we have adopted, and such inquiries will attest the authenticity of the accounts which we have followed.

Most certainly the systems of Jean Jaques, their countryman, first gave rise to the pretensions of the natives or inhabitants of Geneva to the legislative power. They were stimulated by the insinuations of Voltaire and of the other adepts who flocked to second him.

The part which Voltaire acted was, on one side to encourage the citizens in their disputes with the magistrates, whilst on the other he would insinuate to the natives and inhabitants that they had rights to assert against the citizens themselves. He would invite first one party, then the other to his  
table,



table, and to each he broached the sentiments which he wished to instil into them. To the citizens he would urge, that their legislative power absolutely made the magistrates dependent on them; and he would persuade the natives or inhabitants, that living in the same Republic and subject to the same laws, the equality of nature assimilated their rights to those of citizens; that the time was come when they should cease to be slaves, or to obey laws which they had not made; that they were no longer to be victims of such odious distinctions, or subject to taxes disgraceful, inasmuch as they were levied without their having consented to them.

Such insinuations acquired new vigour from the numerous pamphlets flowing from the fertile pen of the Premier Chief. Under the name of a Genevese he published the *Republican Ideas*, which will always bear testimony of his hatred for Kings, and show how much ground Republican Liberty had gained in his heart as he advanced in years.

As to this hatred, he expresses it in the above pamphlet, by saying, "There never yet has  
 " existed a perfect government, because men are  
 " prone to their passions—*The most tolerable, without*  
 " *doubt, is the Republican, because, under that*  
 " *form, men approach the nearest to the equality of*  
 " *nature.* Every father of a family should be  
 " master in his own house, but is to have no  
 " power over the house of his neighbour. So-

VOL. II.

P

"ciety

“ciety being an aggregate of many houses, and of  
 “many lands belonging to them, *it would be a*  
 “contradictory proposition to pretend that *one*  
 “*man* should have the sole dominion over all those  
 “houses and lands; *and it is natural, that each*  
 “*master should have his vote for the general welfare*  
 “*of society* \*.”

This article alone was sufficient to incite the Genevese to revolt, particularly the natives and others who had acquired lands under the dominion of the Republic. He told them, that to deprive them of the right of voting was to rob them of a natural right inherent to them. But to express himself in still clearer terms, the true disciple of Montesquieu and Jean Jaques, he repeats their fundamental tenets; he tells the Genevese, “that civil  
 “government *is the will of ALL, executed by one*  
 “*or many, by virtue of laws which ALL have en-*  
 “*acted* †.” With respect to finance, it is well known, that it is the right of the citizens to regulate and determine what is to be granted for the expences of the State †.

It

\* Republican Ideas, No. 43. Edit. of Kell.

† Ibid. No. 13.

† Ibid. No. 42. Many people cannot conceive that Voltaire could have fallen into such Democracy. Let them read his latter works with attention, and particularly those from which we have made the above extracts, and they will find that he is even violent against the distinction of *Noble*  
 (he

It was not possible to tell all those, who lived under the Genevese dominion without having voted at the enacting of the laws, or at the imposition of the taxes, that they were bound by no tie under

(he who holds lands by knights services) and *Roturier* (who holds lands in foccage). He even declares the origin and real signification of these two words to be no other than Lord and Slave.

Let them read *his Commentary on the Spirit of Laws*, and they will see in what a light he viewed that nobility, among whom he nevertheless numbered so many admirers, and to whom he was so much indebted for the propagation of his Philosophism. Is it not hatred which makes him say in this Commentary, "I could wish that the author (Montesquieu), or any other writer possessing such abilities, had explained more clearly why *the nobility* are essential to the Monarchical form of government. One should rather be tempted to believe, that it was the essence of the Feudal System, as in Germany, or of Aristocracy as at Venice." (No. 111.)

To us it appears, that, whether young or old, Voltaire often confounds all his ideas. The idea of nobility, in general, represents to us the children of men distinguished by their services either civil or military, forming a body in the state whose sentiments and education, whose very interest, often fits them for those employments which are at the disposal of the Sovereign. Undoubtedly such a distinction may take place without the Feudal Systems of the Germans, or the Aristocracy of the Venetians. It is possible indeed to conceive a Monarchy without a body of nobility; but most certainly such a distinction greatly tends to form a body of men more attached to the Monarch, and very useful to the State in those stations for which the general education of the multitude can seldom be a suitable preparative.

P 2

their

their present government; and that no government could exist for them until the ancient constitution was overthrown. Let the reader judge what an impression such writings must have made, profusely spread about, and distributed with that art which we have seen Voltaire describing, when he wished to infuse his venomous doctrines into the lowest classes of the people.

But means still more perfidious were made use of. The Sophisters have been seen extolling the generosity of their Premier; and, as a proof, they cite the multitude of Genevese artizans who taking refuge at Ferney found a new country and protection in Voltaire's little province, and partook sufficiently of his riches to continue their trades and support their families. But when we interrogate those who on the spot could observe the secret motives of such a perfidious generosity, we hear them answer, "Voltaire, it is true, has been in some sort the founder of Ferney, of a new town; but they will add, how did he people it, if it was not with those factious citizens whom he had stirred up against their country, and which he reunites at Ferney and Versoi to form a focus of insurrection, which was to force the unhappy Republic, by the desertion of its natives and inhabitants, to receive the law from the Sophisters, and to substitute their systems to the ancient laws of the Republic?"

Notwith-

Notwithstanding all these means and intrigues, the levelling sect had other agents who forwarded the revolution at Geneva. It had already acquired that Clavière, who was hereafter to continue his revolutionary career at Paris; it had acquired a sort of petty Syeyes in the person of Berenger, and a true firebrand in Segère; but above all it gloried in seeing a French magistrate leaving his country, and laying aside the comely habit of the bench for the filthy round head of the Jacobin. Mess.  
Servan  
and Bo-  
vier. This was Mr. de Servan, that Attorney-General of Grenoble, whom Voltaire in his correspondence with D'Alembert represents as one of the *greatest proficients* in modern philosophy, and as one of those who had chiefly *forwarded its progress*. It is remarkable, that this letter bears date the 5th of November 1770, the very year of the Genevese Revolution. Like a true apostle of Liberty and Equality, Mr. Servan had hurried away to Geneva to unite his efforts to those of Voltaire. But Philosophism had not confined its succours to his talents and reputation alone. An attorney of the name of Bovier of the same parliament, powerfully aided it with his pen. He appeared with all the arms of Sophistry. Whilst the other adepts were stirring up, in their clubs and private companies, the citizen against the magistrate, and the native and inhabitant against the citizen, Bovier, to raise his constitution of Equality from the midst of.

discord and civil broils, pretends to assert the real rights of the ancient constitution, not to form a new one ; and from antiquity alone he appears to draw all his arguments in favor of the Equality and Sovereignty of the People.

The most revolutionary among the Genevese were surprized to see a foreign Sophister informing them, that till then they had been ignorant of their own laws ; that all those distinctions of citizens, inhabitants, or natives, and all the privileges of the first, were novelties which had been usurped and introduced into the Republic so lately as the year 1707 ; that before that period a very short residence entitled every new comer “ to the rights “ of citizen, and to be admitted into the general “ *sovereign and legislative* council. That after one “ year’s residence at Geneva, every man enjoyed “ his share of Sovereignty in the Republic ; in “ short, that the most perfect equality had reigned “ among all the individuals of the State, whether “ of the town or country \*.”

This was nearly the same plan which the sect followed at that time in France, always calling for the States-General in order to re-establish the pretended constitution of the Sovereign and Legislative people. Bovier was refuted in the most complete manner, but the Sophisters knew too well

\* See the Memorial of Bovier from page 15 to 29 ; and the refutation of the natives of Geneva.

that

that a people in a state of revolution swallow every falsehood that favors their Sovereignty. They succeeded in putting them in motion, nor were they ignorant of the means of accelerating and perpetuating their vibrations.

At that time they published at Paris a periodical work under the title of *Ephémérides du Citoyen*. <sup>Parts acted by the Œconomists, and particularly by Dupont de Nemours.</sup> The Œconomists had the direction of it, and that class of adepts was perhaps the most dangerous. They, with all the appearance of moderation, with all the show of patriotic zeal, forwarded the revolution more efficaciously than the frantic rebels of Holbach's Club. The sect had ordained that this journal should support the efforts of Voltaire, Servan, and Bovier, until they had succeeded in their democratic essay on Geneva. It was the hypocritical and smooth-tongued Dupont de Nemours, who was entrusted with the care of giving monthly a new shock to the Revolutionists. His periodical publications, carefully directed towards that object, were regularly sent from Paris to Geneva to second the fury of the Democratizing Zealots.

To form a proper judgment of the artful manner in which Dupont fulfilled his trust, it would be necessary to run over all the articles which the *Ephemeros Citizen* has given us under the head of *Geneva*. There we should see the humane citizen lamenting the troubles which had already shortened

the lives of some natives, and had banished many others from their country; then, fired by that love of peace and humanity which consumes the philosophic breast, he insinuates exactly such remedies as may throw the whole Republic into a flame. He represents their constitution as that of the most oppressive *Aristocracy*. He assimilates the natives and inhabitants of Geneva to the *Helots* or the slaves of Greece, who, under the dominion of free citizens, have nothing but the most abject slavery to look up to in the very heart of a Republic \*. Then for the instruction of the Genevese *Helots* he lays down what he calls principles, or rather lessons of rebellion; such for example as these given to a people in the most violent ferment. “To say that men can tacitly or formally consent for themselves or their descendants to the privation of the *whole* or *part* of their liberty, would be to say, that men have the right to stipulate against the rights of other men, to sell and cede what belongs to others, to alienate their happiness, and perhaps destroy their very lives:—and of what others? of those whose happiness and whose lives should be the most sacred to them,—of their posterity. Such a doctrine would be a libel on the dignity of human nature, and an insult to its Great Creator †.”

\* Ibid, Chap. 1. and Note.

† Ibid, Chap. 2.

This



This certainly was insulting both reason and society in the grossest terms; for if every man who subjects himself to the empire of civil laws does not sacrifice a part of his liberty, he is then as free to violate those laws, though living in society, as he would be were he living among the savages in the woods of America. But it was through pity and humanity that they fed this people, in open revolution, with the most frantic licentiousness. It was to spare the effusion of blood in Geneva that Dupont taught the multitude of *natives, inhabitants, and burgeses*, to say to the senators, “ Do you imagine the exercise of Sovereignty to “ be sufficient, as if the proper exercise of it were “ not an obligation. Do you know that when “ the people have once *recognized* your authority, “ you are imperatively and strictly obliged, under “ pain of the most deserved execration, to render “ them happy, to protect their liberty, to guarantee and defend their rights of property to the “ utmost extent. Republicans, if you wish your “ fellow-citizens to exercise Sovereignty, remember that even Kings only enjoy their power on “ these terms.

“ Would you wish to be worse Sovereigns than “ the arbitrary Despots of Asia? And when even “ those who reign over nations buried in ignorance “ and fanaticism abuse their monstrous power to a “ certain excess . . . . . They are called tyrants.  
“ Do

“ Do you know what happens to them ? Go to  
 “ the gates of the seraglios of the East, *behold the*  
 “ *people calling for the HEADS of the Vifirs and*  
 “ *Atbemadoulcts* ; and sometimes striking off those  
 “ of the Sultans and Sophis. Now reign arbitra-  
 “ rily if you dare. Yes, dare it in your town,  
 “ where the people are far from being ignorant,  
 “ and, brought up with you from your childhood,  
 “ have had many occasions, setting aside your  
 “ dignity, to know that you are no better than  
 “ they \*.”

Thus we see that our moderate and humane Sophisters would not lose an occasion, any more than Raynal, or Holbach's Club, of teaching the people to roar rather than to groan, and to wade through carnage preceded by terror to the conquest of their pretended rights.

Such lessons were intermixed with those which the Œconomists pretended to give to Sovereigns on the administration of finances. “ One saw  
 “ them, say the memoirs of the man who follow-  
 “ ed their operations with the greatest accuracy  
 “ during the whole of this Revolution,—one saw  
 “ them insinuating themselves into all the affairs  
 “ of the State, to seize every opportunity of in-  
 “ fusing the doctrines of the sect. Amidst their  
 “ lessons on œconomy, that on the razing our for-

\* Ibid. Chap. 2.

“ tifications

" tifications is not to be forgotten ; their pretence  
 " was the great expence and little utility of them.  
 " Geneva, they would say, cannot be considered  
 " as a state capable of defending a fortress should  
 " it be at war with any of the neighbouring States ;  
 " and with respect to a surprize, it is the inhabitants  
 " of the country that are to prove its defence \* :  
 " A most absurd proposition for a State about a  
 " league square. But that was not their object ;  
 " they wished to establish the general principle,  
 " and to apply it hereafter to France, or any  
 " other State, when the opportunity should offer."

In other words, it was the means of exposing the  
 Sovereign to all the fury of a revolted people re-  
 claiming by force of arms that Liberty and Equa-  
 lity which the Sophisters were perpetually repre-  
 senting to them as their inherent rights. This  
 also was the object of those perfidious lessons which  
 they pretended to give to the magistrates, repre-  
 senting them as oppressors, and presupposing the  
 existence of that hatred against them which the  
 adepts themselves had infused into the minds of  
 the people. With the same art they thus again  
 addressed us, says our observer: " The natural  
 " defenders of Geneva are the people of the coun-  
 " try, the subjects of the Republic. It is possi-  
 " ble, nay, it is easy, to attach them so much to

• Ephem. du Citoyen, 1771. Vol. I,

" the

“ the Republic, that they would form the most secure advanced posts possible. But it would be necessary that their country should be far other-wise than a *barb, severe, and exalting master* ; it would be necessary to restore them to the free exercise of the natural rights of man, and to guarantee their possession \*.”

The sect reaped a twofold advantage from this journal. First, by spreading it through France, and preparing the multitude to hold at a future day a similar language to their Kings ; secondly, to kindle anew the flame of discord at the beginning of every month among the unfortunate people of Geneva, for whom it appeared to be written. The brotherhood at Paris continued this work until Servan, and the other agents of the sect, had seen their plots effectuate a Revolution in Geneva, and a total overthrow of the ancient laws of that Republic.

\* Ephem. du Citoyen, page 176. I have sought in vain to learn what species of oppression the people of Geneva suffered under their magistrates ; I have found that it was not possible for a people to be more fondly or more justly attached to their government ; that the union between the magistrates and the subjects resembled that of a numerous family with its Chiefs. The Sophisters knew this too well ; but they were not speaking for the Genevese alone. They pre-supposed discord, that they might create it where it did not exist, and add to it where it already began to spread.

It

It is true, the Sophisters did not long enjoy their success, as Mr. de Vergennes, who at first had viewed this Revolution with indifference, soon learned its importance. Evidence at length convinced him that all that had come to pass at Geneva was nothing more than an essay which our modern Sophisters were making of their principles and systems; that neither their plans nor their plots were to be concluded by these first successes; that they were nothing more than a prelude to the revolutionary scenes with which they threatened all Europe, and which might ere long involve France itself in the common mass of ruin.

The Sophisters had the mortification to see these first fruits of their revolutionary principles blasted by a few battalions of French troops. It was reserved to Clavierre, and afterwards to Robespierre, to resume their plans, and to send the apostate Soulavie to consummate them by murder and exile, in short by all the revolutionary means which Philosophism had invented in the Castle of Ferney for the future benefit of the Jacobinical den\*.

\* The above Chapter, whether with respect to the general conduct of the Sophisters, or more particularly with respect to the conduct of Voltaire, Servan, or Dupont de Nemours, during the Revolution of Geneva, has been entirely formed on memoirs with which eye-witnesses have favored us, and on the writings of the Sophisters, which have been quoted with the greatest precision.

CHAP.

## CHAP. VII.

*Aristocratical Essay in France.*

Object of this essay. IN laying before the reader the proofs of the Conspiracy formed against Monarchy we have said, that there existed a set of Philosophers who held themselves so secure of bringing about a Revolution, that they had not scrupled to advise both the King and his Ministers to make the Revolution themselves, lest Philosophy might not be sufficiently powerful to direct the motion when once imparted. Among this class of Philosophers, who wished to be styled the *Moderates*, but whom Jean Jaques calls the *Inconsistent*, we are to distinguish Mr. de Mably, the brother of Condillac, and one of those Abbés who bore nothing of the Ecclesiastic but the dress, and who, bestowing great application on prophane sciences, was almost entirely ignorant of those necessary for an Ecclesiastic.

Mably  
and his  
errors,  
and his  
adhe-  
rents.

Without being impious like a Voltaire or a Condorcet, even though adverse to their impiety, his own tenets were extremely equivocal. At times his morality was so very disgusting, that it was necessary to suppose that his language was ambiguous, and that he had been misunderstood,  
let

left one should be obliged to throw off all esteem for his character. At least such has been the defence I have heard him make to justify himself from the censures of the Sorbonne. He had the highest opinion of his own knowledge in politics, and during his whole life that was his favourite topic; he believed himself transcendant in that science, and he met with others who were led to the same belief. His *mediocre* talents would have been better appreciated, had he been viewed in the light of a man led away by the prejudices he had imbibed from a scanty knowledge of antiquity, and who wished to reduce every thing to the standard of his own ideas.

Mr. de Mably had also been led away by all those Systems of Liberty, of the Sovereignty and Legislative authority of the people, of the rights of self-taxation and of contributing to the public expences only in as much as they had voted the monies themselves or by their representatives.— He was persuaded that he had found these Systems of Government among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and more particularly among the ancient Gauls. He was perfectly persuaded, that without the States General the French Monarchy could not exist; and that to re-establish the ancient and real Constitution, it was necessary to resume those States General\*.

\* See his Rights of the Citizen.

Mably

Mably and his disciples, or more properly the adherents of Montesquieu, detested the feudal laws ; but they did not reflect that it was to those very laws the States-General owed their former existence. When Philip Le Bel and some other Princes had found themselves under the necessity of applying to those States for subsidies, the reason was, because under the feudal system the King, like the Counts of Provence, Champagne, and Thoulouse, or the Dukes of Brittany, had their fixed revenues and particular desmenes which were supposed to suffice for the exigencies of the state. And in fact wars of the longest duration could be carried on without its being necessary to augment the revenues of the Sovereign. Armies at that time were composed of the Lords and Knights serving at their own expence and defraying that of their vassals whom they led after them into the field. Neither Mably nor his disciples would reflect that at a period when France had acquired so many new Provinces, when the armies, general officers, and soldiers, waged war solely at the King's expence, it was impossible for the ancient crown lands to supply the wants of Government. They could not conceive, that in the new system of politics, it would have been the height of imprudence for the Monarch in France to be dependent (every time he found it necessary to repel or anticipate an attack of the foreign enemy)

on



on the great and jealous Lord, on the seditious tribune, or on the surly deputy, perhaps even in the interest of the enemy, for the necessary subsidies on so pressing an occasion. Such reflections as these never occurred to the minds of our Sophisters.

Filled with the idea, that Revolution and the States General were necessary to break the chains of the French people, we are told by his strongest adherents, that Mably went still farther than merely inviting the Sovereign and his Ministers to commence the Revolution themselves : “ He up-  
 “ braided the people in his Treatise *on the Rights*  
 “ *of Citizens*, written in the year 1771, with  
 “ having missed the opportunity of making the  
 “ Revolution ; and he lays down the means of  
 “ effecting it. He advised the Parliament in fu-  
 “ ture to refuse to enregister any burſal edict, to  
 “ declare to the King that he had no right to im-  
 “ poſe taxes on the people, who alone were veſted  
 “ with the fiſcal power, *to aſk pardon of the people*  
 “ for having co-operated during ſo long a time  
 “ in the levy of ſuch unjuſt taxes, and to ſuppli-  
 “ cate his Majeſty to convoke the States Ge-  
 “ neral. *A Revolution*, he adds, brought about  
 “ by ſuch means would be the more advanta-  
 “ geous as it would be founded on the love of

At what  
period,  
and why  
they call  
for the  
States  
General.

VOL. II.

Q

“ order

“ order and of the laws, and not on licentious  
 “ liberty \*.”

This system of a Revolution to be accomplished, according to Montesquieu's ideas, by vesting the legislative and fiscal powers in the hands of the people, or of their representatives in the States General, found many supporters and abettors; and particularly among the Aristocracy, as the distinction of the three states was still preserved. All that class of men which impiety had enrolled under the banners of Sophistry from among the Duke de la Rochefoucault's society, viewed this as a means for the Grandees to reassume their ancient influence in the state, and to conquer from the King and Court, that power which they had gradually lost under the preceding reigns. They were ignorant that other Sophisters were already prepared to enforce their systems of Equality in those States General, and to assert, that *the three estates being separate, of opposite interests, and jealous of each other, mutually destroyed each other's strength; and that to this distinction was to be attributed the inefficacy, and the very little good that had arisen from all the former States General.* The Grandees did not perceive this snare which the levelling Sophisters had laid for them; the levellers had conceived

\* Gudin's Supplement to the Social Contract, 3d Part, Chap. 1.

the

the greatest expectations from the dissensions which reigned at that period between Lewis XV. and the Parliaments, and believed themselves on the eve of obtaining the convocation of those States General where they were to consummate their revolution.

These dissensions were principally owing to an opinion originating in Montesquieu's systems, which had crept into the first tribunals of the state. Such magistrates as, according to that system, believed Liberty to be entirely annulled in every state where the people or its representatives did not partake of the legislative and fiscal powers with the King, had construed their Parliaments into the representatives of the people, and pretended that the different Parliaments, though dispersed in different towns throughout the state, constituted but one and the same body, holding their powers directly from the people, whose perpetual representatives they pretended to be, whose rights they were to support against the encroachments of the crown, and exercising for them that inalienable and indefeasible right of making laws and voting subsidies; although they were resident magistrates and fixed in different towns by the King to administer justice in his name.

This was a system of Parliaments very widely different from the idea which the French Kings, who had created them without even taking the

Q 2

sense

sense of the nation, had conceived of these Judiciary Courts. It was indeed extraordinary, that tribunals either ambulant or stationary, and which the Kings had created at their own will and pleasure, should belong to the very essence of the Constitution; that a body of Magistrates all named by the King should pretend to be the free chosen representatives of the people, and a magistracy so much at the disposition of the Sovereigns, that they had sold the offices; could then these men pretend to assimilate themselves to representatives deputed by the people to the States General \*.

\* The denomination of *Parlement* (Parliament), which had been given to the first Tribunals of the state, had greatly contributed to the illusion, which might have been easily avoided had the old term of *Plaid* (*court* *lect*) been preserved, which in the ancient history of France denotes sometimes those great assemblies which the King deliberated with on important questions respecting the state, at other times those ambulatory tribunals which administered justice. It was these latter only that our Kings had perpetuated under the name of Parliaments. The difference is the more evident, as those great Assemblies or States General never meddled with the Judiciary Power, the exercise of which constituted the sole functions of the ambulant Magistracy. In those great Assemblies or *National Plaids* the Clergy was always admitted as the first order of the state; whereas by the very nature of its duties, it was excluded from the *Judiciary Plaids* (see the President Hainault, an. 1137, 1319, & *passim*); how then was it possible to confound the States General with the Judiciary Plaids or Parliaments?

The

The states themselves never viewed the Parliaments in any other light, which is easy to be seen by what the President Hainault says on the states held in 1614: "On this occasion I must say, "that as we recognize no other authority in "France but that of the King, it is by his authority that laws are made. *As wills the King so wills the Law.* On that account the States General can only remonstrate and humbly supplicate. The King hearkens to their grievances and prayers in his prudence and his justice.— For, was he obliged to grant all that was asked of him, says one of our most celebrated authors, he would cease to be their King. *It is for that reason that during the sittings of the States General the authority of the Parliament suffers no diminution*, as exercising no other power but that of the King, which may be easily seen in the minutes of the last states\*."

It was therefore a most extraordinary claim of these Parliaments, all created by, and exercising the authority of the King only, to pretend to be the representatives of the people in order to resist the power of that same King; styling themselves the habitual and permanent representatives of the States General, who had never formed the least idea of such representa-

\* History of France, anno 1614.

tives, and who had always looked upon them as the King's Magistrates. But when new systems had spread disquietude in every breast, and produced the thirst of Revolution, illusion easily banished truth. The most respectable Magistrates, overpowered by the weight of Montesquieu's authority, and spurred on by the Sophisters, were easily persuaded that every country was enslaved, and groaned under the most severe despotism, where the legislative and fiscal powers were not in the hands of the people or of their representatives. And, lest the whole code of laws which the Kings had made and the Parliaments proclaimed, should suddenly become null and void, these Magistrates, who had enregistered and proclaimed them, constituted themselves the representatives of the people.

These claims served as a pretence for the most invincible resistance to the orders of their Sovereign. The King's council, and particularly Mr. de Mau-pou, furnished a coalition aiming at nothing less than to disorder the Monarchy, to diminish the authority of the throne, to put the Sovereign under the habitual dependence of the Twelve Parliaments, and to create disturbances and disputes between the King and his Tribunals as often as any factious Magistrate, assuming the character of a tribune of the people, should oppose the pretended will of the nation to his Sovereign. Lewis XV.  
resolved

resolved to annihilate such Parliaments, and to create new ones more limited in their powers, and which might be restrained within the bounds of their duty with greater ease.

This resolve was being put in execution, and the Sophisters rejoiced to see the disputes daily increase. Convinced that these dissensions would necessarily oblige the King to assemble the States General, where they should be able to find means of publishing their plans and of operating, at least in part, the Revolution they so ardently wished for, they brought forward that same Malesherbes, whom we have seen so active in seconding the Sophisters of Impiety. He was at that time President of the *Cour des Aides*, the first tribunal in Paris after the Parliament. He engaged his *company* to make the first signal step towards opposing the States General to the authority of the Monarch. He formed those remonstrances since so famous among the Philosophers, because, under the cloak of a few respectful expressions, he had broached all the new principles of the sect and all their pretensions against the authority of their Sovereign.

In those remonstrances we see the demand for the States-General couched in the following terms;  
 “ Until this period at least the reclamations of the  
 “ Courts supplied, though imperfectly, the want  
 “ of the States-General; for, notwithstanding our  
 “ zeal, we cannot pretend to say, that we have  
 “ been

Malesherbes and the Parliaments ask for the States General.

“ been able to make amends to the nation for the  
 “ great advantages which must have accrued to it,  
 “ by the intercourse between its representatives  
 “ and the Sovereign. *But at present the sole re-*  
 “ *source* which had been left to the people is torn  
 “ from them. By whom shall their interests be  
 “ asserted against the minister ? The people  
 “ dispersed have no common organ by which  
 “ they may prefer their complaints. *Sire, inter-*  
 “ *rogate then the nation itself,* since that alone re-  
 “ mains to which your Majesty can hearken \*.”

The other parliaments who followed Maleherbes's example were ignorant of the intentions of the sect which had prompted him to act. They abandoned themselves to the torrent, and were hurried away by the impulse given by the Sophisters and by the public opinion, which the system of Montesquieu on the Legislative and Fiscal Powers had new-modelled.

Misled by Maleherbes's example, the Parliament of Rouen also asked for the States-General in their remonstrances of the 19th March 1771.  
 “ Sire, Since the efforts of the Magistracy are  
 “ fruitless, deign to consult the Nation assembled.”  
 But the former colleagues of Montesquieu, the Parliament of Bourdeaux thought it incumbent on them to show more than ordinary zeal for his principles, as is to be seen by the pressing style in

• Remonstrance of the Cour des Aides, Feb. 28, 1771.

which



which their remonstrances of the 25th February 1771, are couched,

“ If it be true (say these Magistrates), that the  
 “ Parliament, become sedentary under Philip le  
 “ Bel, and perpetual under Charles VI. is not the  
 “ same as the Ambulant Parliament convoked  
 “ during the first years of Philip le Bel's reign,  
 “ under Lewis IX. under Lewis VIII. and under  
 “ Philip Augustus ; the same as the *Placita* con-  
 “ voked under *Charlemagne and his descendants* ;  
 “ the same as those ancient assemblies of the  
 “ Franks of which history has preserved the me-  
 “ mory both before and after the conquest ; if  
 “ the distribution of this Parliament to different  
 “ districts has changed the *essence of its Constitution*,  
 “ in short, Sire, though your Courts of Parlia-  
 “ ment should not have the right of examining  
 “ and verifying the new laws which your Majesty  
 “ may please to propose, *still the nation cannot be*  
 “ *deprived of that right, it is a right that cannot be*  
 “ *lost ; it is inalienable. To attack that right is not*  
 “ *only to betray the Nation but the King himself.* It  
 “ would be to overthrow the constitution of the  
 “ kingdom. It would be to attack the authority  
 “ of the Monarch in its very principles. Will it  
 “ be believed, that the verification of the new  
 “ laws being made by your Courts in Parliament  
 “ *does not compensate for this primitive right of the*  
 “ *nation ? Can public order be benefited by this*  
 “ power

“ power being once more exercised by the nation?  
 “ Should his Majesty deign to re-establish the  
 “ people in their rights, he would see us no longer  
 “ claiming that portion of *authority* which the  
 “ Kings, your predecessors, have entrusted us  
 “ with, as soon as the nation assembled *shall ex-*  
 “ ercise that power itself.”

It is thus that the Parliaments, a prey to a faction with whose dark designs they were wholly unacquainted, were craving pardon as it were of the people for having forgotten their inherent and inalienable rights of Legislation and of Sovereignty, at least in part, in the Assembly of the States-General. They did not foresee that a day would come when they would have to ask pardon of the people for having called for those same States-General, so fatal to the King, to themselves and to the nation.

How this demand prepared the way for the Revolution.

The Revolution would have been accomplished at that time had Lewis XV. shown less resolution. It was precisely at that period when the sect, painted in such true colors a few months before by the Attorney General of the Parliament of Paris,  
 “ *was seeking to excite the people to revolt under pre-*  
 “ *tence of enlightening them*; when its disquiet and  
 “ daring genius, inimical to all dependence, as-  
 “ pired at the overthrow of every political con-  
 “ stitution, and whose views would only be ac-  
 “ complished when they had succeeded in throw-  
 “ ing

“ing the legislative and executive powers into the  
 “hands of the multitude, *when the Majesty of*  
 “*Kings had been reviled, and their authority had*  
 “*been rendered precarious and subordinate to the ca-*  
 “*pricious starts of an ignorant mob.*”

It was at that period “when the numbers of  
 “the profelytes were increasing and the maxims  
 “of the sect were spreading far and wide, when  
 “kingdoms felt themselves shaken in their foun-  
 “dations; when nations, astonished, asked each  
 “other, whence arose the extraordinary changes  
 “which had been operated among them?” In a  
 word, it was at that period when Mably and his  
 disciples were conjuring a Revolution, when the  
 Œconomists were circulating and infusing their  
 principles into every class of the people, when the  
 Philosophers *foresaw the Revolution, foretold it,*  
 and proposed *the manner of accomplishing it by means*  
*of a combination with the people* \*.

From that period the convocation of the States-  
 General must have infallibly brought about the  
 Revolution. The Sophisters needed no longer to  
 inspire the Magistracy with their systems. The  
 principles were admitted, though the application  
 of them might vary. The right of verifying and  
 examining the laws had been recognized as *a pri-*  
*mitive and inalienable* right inherent to the people.

\* See Gudin, Suppl. to the Social Contract.

If

If the parliament in the days of its illusion only held this language to their Sovereign to assert their authority against his Ministers, still the Sophisters wished for no further declarations, *to revile the Majesty of Kings, and to render their authority precarious and subordinate to the capricious farts of an ignorant mob.* From the right of examining to the right of rejecting, or to the right of insurrection, in short, to all the rights of the Revolutionary Code, there was but one step further; and the Sophisters at the head of the multitude were ready prepared to bear down every opposition to that measure. Almost every existing law was null, because it had been made by the King without consulting the people; and all laws might be set aside, because the people had a right to examine them anew and hence proscribe them, if such was their will and pleasure.

Of those  
who fe-  
conded  
the Revo-  
lution.

Such a one, nevertheless, was to be a moderate Revolution in the language of the Sophisters. It was not only those Magistrates who, wresting from the Sovereign his rights and transferring them to the people, and hoping by that means to enjoy the whole power in their assemblies, were the abettors of this Revolution; but also that numerous class of the Aristocracy, whom we shall see hereafter carrying to the States-General all those systems of the legislative people; of a people preserving all the hierarchy of birth in their

their legislative assemblies; of a people adopting Montesquieu's principles only in as far as they applied to, and threw the power into the hands of the Aristocracy; in fine, this revolution was forwarded and supported by all that class of Sophisters who, contented with having asserted the principles of the *Legislative and Sovereign people*, were pleased to continue the name of King to the first minister of that people.

Lewis XV. was perfectly aware that he was on the eve of losing the most precious rights of his crown. Naturally humane, and an enemy to all acts of authority, he was nevertheless determined to transmit whole and unimpaired to his successor the power which he had received on ascending the throne. He wished to die as he had lived, a King: He dissolved the Parliaments, refused to convoke the States-General, and never permitted them even to be mentioned during the remainder of his reign. But he knew that in repressing the Magistrates he had not crushed the monster of Revolution. He more than once expressed his fears for the young Prince heir to his throne. He was even so much convinced that the Sophisters would make the most violent efforts against his successors, that he would say with a tone of disquietude, *I should like to know how Berri will get over all this*; meaning his grandson, afterwards Lewis XVI. who bore the name of Berri during the life

It is  
averted  
by Lewis  
XV.

life-time of his father, who died Dauphin. Lewis XV. however found means to stop the Revolution which menaced France during his life-time. The conspirators perceived it necessary to defer their plans. They were content with preparing the people for its execution. In the mean time *the* sect made other essays of a different nature, which shall not be lost to History.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Essay of the Sophisters against Aristocracy.*

THE distinctions of King and Subject, of the Sovereign making and the Multitude obeying the law, were not the only points which militated against the principles of a school that recognized no other, whether religious or political, than *Liberty and Equality*. In all civil societies there exist men elevated above the horizontal plane of the multitude, men who are to be distinguished by their rank, by their titles, or by the privileges granted to their birth, to their own services, or to those of their ancestors; men who, by the industry of their forefathers, or by their own, have acquired riches and abundance, of which their fellow-citizens cannot partake; in fine, men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, while others enjoy the benefit of their labours in consideration of a salary which they pay them. If the distinctions of nobleman and commoner be not every where known, those of poor and rich are universally understood.

Philosophism re-kindles the hatred against the nobles and the wealthy in Germany.

What-

Whatever interest the numberless adepts in the higher classes might have had not to push too far the consequences of that Equality which they had applied to their God, there were many adepts in the lower classes who did not partake of any such restraint. Many of these latter were to be found in France, but a much greater number in Germany and Poland, and in many other parts of Europe, where the principles of our modern Sophisters had gained admittance.

As early as the year 1766, we have seen Frederic writing to Voltaire, "*That Philosophy was beginning to penetrate even into superstitious Bohemia, and into Austria, the ancient abode of superstition.*" And it is to that year that we are able to trace the first seeds of a plan which was to gratify the Sophisters with a new Republic in those countries, where the distinctions of Marquis or Clown, of Noble or Burgefs, of rich or poor, were to vanish from before their sight.

Conspiracy of the Austrian and Bohemian Sophisters against the Nobility.

The whole of what we are about to relate concerning this plan, and the various essays made by Philosophism to extend its branches to Austria and Bohemia, even to Hungary and Transilvania, will be extracted from two Memorials, with which we have been favoured by persons who, being on the spot, were enabled to observe with the greatest precision the one the causes, the other the effects, which enabled the German Sophisters to  
glory



glory in having preceded our Carmagnols and Septembrizing butchers in their Revolutionary depredations.

Scarcely had the French Philosophism penetrated to the banks of the Moldaw, when those baneful principles of *Liberty and Equality* which formerly had led the Hussites and Thaborites to the enthusiastic murder of the Clergy and Nobility, to the laying in ashes the Castles and Monasteries, were seen to ferment anew. A conspiracy was formed at Prague, and it was to break out on the 16th of May. It was customary on that day for multitudes of the common people to throng into town, to celebrate the feast of St. Jean Nepomucene. At the time of this immense concourse of people from the country, some thousands of armed Conspirators were suddenly to appear; others were to make themselves masters of the bridge and gates; others again were to mix among the people; to harangue them, to announce the dawn of rising Liberty, and to exhort them to throw off the yoke of Slavery, and to take possession of those lands which they had so long watered with the sweat of their brows, and whose fruit only enriched a set of tyrannical, haughty, vain, and idle Lords.

Such language, it may easily be conceived, must have made a strong impression on men who, for the greatest part, cultivated lands which they only

VOL. II.

R

held

held at the pleasure of the Lord, in consideration of so many days work every week, employed in the culture of the Lord's lands \*. Arms were to be distributed to this populace suddenly heated by the cry of Liberty and Equality. The Lords and the rich were to fall the first victims of *their* fury; the lands distributed to the murderers, and

\* The peasantry called *Robota* were not all in an equal degree of slavery. Some held their lands for three, others for four days labour per week. However just the conditions of such a servitude were in themselves, it was nevertheless difficult for the traveller accustomed to other governments not to be persuaded, that these men were very unhappy. I was of that opinion, when an unexpected sight nearly reconciled me to that mode of administration. It was an immense granary belonging to the Lord. In the middle of a large hall were vast heaps of corn; around the place as many divisions as there were families in the village, and each division contained the corn belonging to one family. An overseer attended at the distributions, which were made once a week. If the stock of any particular division was exhausted, the necessary quantity was taken from the Lord's heap for the family in need, who were to replace the corn so taken at the ensuing harvest. By this means the poorest peasant was certain of his sustenance. Let the reader decide, whether such a government may not be as good as others, where the poor man may often starve in the possession of perfect Liberty. I know what might be wished for under every administration; but it is not the part of true Philosophy to overthrow existing governments in the chimerical idea of reducing, some day or other, every thing to its own plans.

Liberty

Liberty proclaimed, we should have beheld Bohemia the first Republican offspring of Philosophim.

Secretly however as this plot was carried on, some of the adepts ere long betrayed the secret.— Maria Theresa, the Empress Queen, found means of stifling the whole, and her council behaved with so much prudence and dexterity, that the public journals of the time scarcely mention it. Perhaps the court judged wisely, and thought it prudent to gain over the chiefs, rather than by executions to call the attention of the public to principles which have but too often stained Bohemia with the blood of its best inhabitants.

Notwithstanding the very small success that had attended their attempt, the Sophisters of the Danube and Moldau did not lose all hopes of effectuating their schemes of Equality. They invented a plan which drew the Empress Queen into the delusion, and still more her successor Joseph II. —The apparent object of this plan was, that proprietors whose lands were so extensive that they were unable to cultivate them, should be obliged to cede a part of such lands to the peasantry. These, in return, were to pay an annual rent to the former proprietors equal in value to the estimated revenue. Each community was to engage to punish severely every peasant who should neglect either the cultivation of the land ceded, or the payment of the settled rent.

New  
plans of  
the Au-  
strian So-  
phisters.

R 2

This

This plan was presented to the Empress Queen with so much art, that she was persuaded it had no other view than the enriching of the state by favouring the industry and encouraging the emulation of the real cultivators. She therefore gave orders to various agents of government to send in Memorials on the subject: and herself tried the experiment by ceding some of the crown lands on the aforementioned conditions.

The Sophisters feared the delay attendant on such deliberations; and, to hasten the general execution of their projects, they spread their propositions and plans among the peasantry. Their most ardent missionary was an intriguing priest, who ran to and fro throughout the country, preaching up this reformation of property which he thought admirable. He found it no difficult task to infuse a portion of his enthusiasm into his rustic auditors. The Nobles, viewing this plan in no other light than as a means of despoiling them of their property under the pretence of a just compensation, objected that the peasantry, become masters and proprietors of the land, would soon find means of turning the whole profit to their own use; and that Philosophism would soon invent new reasons for paying no retribution whatever to the Lords (for would it not be doubly unjust to carry any part of the produce of lands to Lords who neither cultivated nor had any *property* in them); in fine, should it  
it

it ever please the peasantry to league together and refuse all payments, the Lords would have lost both their lands and money, and the Nobility, thus reduced, would be able to find no other means of subsistence than by entering into the service of their *quondam* tenants \*.

This opposition only contributed to stimulate the zeal of the levelling apostles. They had given the peasantry every hope of success, and it was easy to irritate them against their opponents. It was soon to be perceived that those vassals who had always been so mild and humble with respect to their Lords had now assumed a haughty and insolent

Infurrection in Bohemia.

\* This may serve to explain the theory of the French Emigration. A friend of mine, who had exercised an almost boundless charity in the manor of which he was Lord, was nearly murdered in the general insurrection of 1789, by that peasantry which he had preserved from the inclemency of the foregoing winter. He was however fortunate enough to escape the hands of the assassins, and, returning to his former mansion, was received with acclamations of joy. On expostulating with his tenants on the treatment he had lately received they begged his pardon in these words: saying, "Ah Sir, we were misled; we were made to believe that if we burnt your title deeds and got rid of you, we should have nothing to pay, and should remain proprietors of the lands we hold; but we ask pardon," &c. He thus escaped the agents, but was afterwards pursued by the revolutionary leaders called Deputies, and is at present involved in the general decree of death pronounced against the Emigrants.

T.

R 3

mien.

mien. It was necessary to resort to punishments, which only added to their complaints and murmurs. The Empress Queen, still misled by the apparent justice of the plan, and the Emperor, whose Philosophism and ambition secretly enjoyed the hopes of humiliating the Nobility, were imprudent enough to receive the complaints of those whom the Lords had thought necessary to punish. This sort of connivance gave our rustic revolvers reason to believe, that they had nothing to fear on the part of government. The Sophistical emissaries persuaded them, that they ought to obtain by force what in justice could not be refused them. Such insinuations naturally produced violence, and in 1773, the insurrection of the peasantry against the Nobility was almost universal throughout Bohemia.

The rustics already began to burn and pillage \* the castles ; the Nobility and the rich proprietors were menaced with a general massacre. The Empress Queen came to a tardy sense of the fault she had committed ; but then at least she lost no time to crush the growing evil. An army of 28,000 men received orders to march and to quell the rioters. The Sophisters had not had the time necessary to organize their Revolutionary bands, and the revolvers were soon defeated.

\* The fate of France 1789,

Those

Those parts of Prussia and Silesia which border on Bohemia had felt the commotion, and it was then that Frederic first divined the intentions of the Sophisters. He had not courted them so far as to disband his army. He was even more resolute than the Empress Queen in eradicating the spirit of revolt. He immediately hung up the mutineers; and our levelling Philosophists were still obliged quietly to behold those disgusting distinctions of Lords and peasants, of Nobles and rich. But they were only pacified for the moment, and never lost sight of their plans. The death of the Empress Queen gave them an occasion of making still more perfidious essays for the destruction of the Nobility.

Initiated in the Sophisticated mysteries, Joseph II. had found means of combining the ideas of Liberty and Equality with those of the Despot; and under pretence of reigning like a Philosopher, levelled every thing around him, that he and his systems might tower alone above the ruined plane. With his pretended liberty of conscience, he would have been the greatest persecutor of his age, had not the French Revolution followed him so closely. With his pretended equality, he only sought to vilify and plunder the Nobility, and to fling their fortunes into the hands of their vassals, in order to overthrow the laws of the Empire, and those of property as well as those of religion, that

Joseph II.'s prevention against the Nobles, and plan for humbling them.

he might not meet with a greater opposition from the Nobility than he would from their vassals.— With all his pretensions to genius, the most awful lessons were necessary to persuade him that the real tendency of this Philosophism of Equality and of religious and political Liberty, was the destruction of the throne as well as of the altar.

Such was the Philosophy of that Prince: whatever may have been his intentions, his innovating genius was unfortunate enough to furnish the pretext for a most cruel insurrection against the Nobility of a large portion of his dominions. The celerity with which he was accustomed to make himself obeyed, may cast cruel doubts on the dilatory manner in which he went to the succour of the unhappy victims.

All that I am about to relate concerning this memorable event, the atrocious memory of which the court of Vienna vainly attempted to stifle, shall be extracted from a relation written by Mr. J. Petty, an English gentleman whom I knew to be one of those who had escaped from the massacre, and is now living at Betchworth near Darking, in the County of Surry. It was to his memorial I alluded when I spoke of one more particularly instructive as to effects. The other, from which I have extracted the greater part of what has been already seen in this Chapter, has a greater application to causes, and shows the connection



nection between those facts and the progress of Philosophism and Jacobinism in the Austrian dominions. On considering these two memorials collectively, we see that it was at Vienna where the Sophisters, under the cloak of Humanity and Liberty, were inventing every means either for the destruction of the Nobility, or to oblige the Lords to renounce their ancient rights over their vassals and villains, and that the orders given by Joseph II. for the mode of defence of the frontiers of Transilvania furnished the means or the occasion for executing their plans. These orders were such, that they were calculated either to rob the Hungarian Lords of their vassals, or to throw them into open rebellion against their masters.

Antecedent to this new plan adopted by the Emperor, the chain of troops destined for the guard of the Turkish frontiers was composed of peasants or villains, who were exempted from a part of their ordinary labours in consideration of this military duty; but were not on that account exempt from dependence on their masters. In the spring of the year 1781, Joseph II. sent the Major General Geny to Hermanstadt, with orders to augment the number of these guards, and to put them on the same footing as the rest of the Imperial troops; that is to say, in a state of perfect independence on their former Lords. The proposed indemnifications did not, however, prevent numerous

numerous reclamations being made. What seemed to justify this opposition, and what was easy to be foreseen (which perhaps might have been the real object of the Sophisters), was, that the peasantry flocked in crouds to be enrolled, and by that means enfranchise themselves from all *submission* and from any services or duties to their Lords.— I must own with truth, and in unison with Mr. Petty, that the fate of the peasantry or villains was much aggravated by the harshness of some of their masters.

Infurrection occasioned in Transilvania by this new plan.

In the mean time, until an answer to the reclamations of the Nobility and proprietors could be obtained from Vienna, the commander in chief at Hermanstadt thought it incumbent on him to declare, that these new enrollments should be considered as operating no change in the political situation of the peasantry, until further orders and instructions should be received from the Emperor. But those orders did not arrive, and the commander in chief had made his declaration too late.— Those villains who had enrolled themselves not only looked upon their enfranchisement as complete, but committed such excesses against their former masters, that the Magistrates were obliged to apply to the commander in chief for the revocation of all the enrollments, as the only method of restoring order. But the revocation proved useless ; it was well known that the Emperor had returned

returned no answer. The peasantry, in lieu of peaceably submitting to their injured Lords, persisted in looking upon themselves as independent soldiers, when on a sudden there appeared a Valachian peasant of the name of Horja who gathered a multitude of them around him. He, decorated with a large star and bearing a patent written in golden letters, declared himself sent by the Emperor to enroll them all. He offered to put himself at their head and to restore them to their liberty. The peasantry flocked to their new general. The Lords and Proprietors sent daily information to the government and to the commander in chief at Hermanstadt of what was passing; of the secret committees which were held in different parts, and of the insurrection which was on the eve of bursting forth. Reproaches for their apprehensions and timidity were the only answers they received.

The day marked out by the Conspirators was approaching, and on the 3d November 1784 Horja appeared at the head of four thousand men. He formed different detachments and sent them to burn the castles and murder the Lords and proprietors. These forerunners of the Jacobin Galley Slaves of Marseilles executed his orders with that sanguinary fury which they had imbibed against the Nobility from the doctrines of Equality, and the

Massacre  
of the  
Nobility  
of Trans-  
ylvania.

the rebels soon counted 12,000 men following their levelling standards. In a very short space of time fifty Noblemen were murdered. Carnage and desolation now spread from county to county; the houses of the Nobility were every where burnt and ransacked, and mere assassination could no longer satiate their sanguinary fury. The unhappy Noblemen who fell into their hands were put to the most excruciating tortures. Some were impaled alive, their hands and feet cut off, and roasted at a slow fire, for such is the humanity of levellers!!—But we will not attempt to comment on the relation we have before us; to extract is a task sufficiently distressing. “ Among the castles  
 “ which were reduced to ashes the most remarkable were those of the Counts D’Esterhazy and  
 “ Tekeli; and of the Noblemen who were murdered the most distinguished were the two  
 “ Counts and Brothers Rebiezi. The eldest was  
 “ spitted and roasted; many others of the same  
 “ family, men, women and children, were cruelly  
 “ massacred. The unfortunate Lady Bradisador, with whom I had spent a few days (says  
 “ Mr. Petty), also fell a melancholy victim.—  
 “ These barbarians seized her, cut off her hands  
 “ and feet, and then left her to linger in that  
 “ state till she expired. But let us turn from such  
 “ horrid subjects: They recall to my mind persons  
 “ forever dear to me, who fell a most wanton  
 “ sacrifice

“ sacrifice to cruelty, on which I have not the  
 “ courage to dilate.”

We also would gladly have withheld such bloody recitals from our readers ; but, when compared to our Septembrizing Jacobins, they become marking features in history. And how much more striking would these lessons be, was it here the place to enumerate the many similar attacks against the nobility with which our *Memoirs on Ancient Jacobinism* are replete. We should there see that same Philosophism of Liberty and Equality forming the same plots and perpetrating the same atrocities against that part of society distinguished by its titles, rank, or riches ; and the Aristocracy may learn from their own history the danger of encouraging sophisticated levellers, who never fawn on them but in hopes of tearing to pieces and devouring the whole of that class which is distinguished by riches and honors.

The connection between the ancient and modern insurrections against the Nobility.

In making a comparison between the Jacobins of the present day and their forefathers, I should not conceal those horrid sights of noblemen roasting, of women mutilated, of whole families massacred, or of the palpitating members of fathers, mothers and children in Transilvania. Nor should I pass over those cannibals of the *Place Dauphine* burning at a slow fire (on the 3d of September 1792) the Countess of *Perignan* and her daughters, *Madame de Chevres*, and so many other victims,

victims, offering the flesh of those whom they had already butchered as food to those who were next to be sacrificed. Such horrid deeds are far from being novelties in the annals of the sect\*. Nor was it reserved to the Carmagnols of Paris or of Transilvania to show the example of such cruelties.

These statements I know will make my reader shudder with horror, but it is a salutary tremor. At length perhaps they will cease to hearken to those Sophistical Apostles of a Liberty and Equality less chimerical than atrocious, and whose systems assimilate man to the ferocious beasts of

\* In our *History of the Clergy during the French Revolution*, we mentioned these atrocious facts of the Place Dauphine, which some of our readers called in question, because they had not witnessed them, though in Paris at the time; but let it be recollected, it was a time when terror would scarcely permit them to raise their heads from their hiding places. Let them consult the writings of Mr. Girtanner, a Swiss physician, who was an eye witness to what he relates. They will learn that the work from which I had made the extract was only a translation from his work, nor did I know at that time that the *Baron de Pellefrier Vien* was the translator, as I have since learned from himself. I have also seen Mr. Cambden, chaplain to one of the Irish regiments. He had printed the same account at Liege, and declared to me that he had only published it on the testimony of twenty different witnesses, who all assured him that Mr. Gertanner and myself had been so far from exaggerating the fact, that we had stopped far short of the horrors of that sanguinary scene.

the

the forest. The error is too fatal ; let us therefore guard against the delusions of pride by the remembrance of deeds humiliating to nature itself. We have witnessed the sanguinary consequences of these vain systems of Liberty and Equality in our own times ; let us venture to examine for a moment what course they took in the days of our ancestors.

In 1358 France had its Jacobins, and their system was *Liberty and Equality*. Froissard, one of the most esteemed French Historians, paints their conduct as follows :

“ In the month of May 1358 France was  
 “ stricken with a strange desolation. Some country  
 “ people, without a chief, and at first not one  
 “ hundred in number, assembled in the Beau-  
 “ voisis, declaring that the nobility were a dishonor  
 “ to the nation, and that it would be a meritorious  
 “ act to destroy them all. Their companions  
 “ answered, ‘ It is true, and evil fall upon the  
 “ man who shall not do his utmost to destroy  
 “ the nobility.’ They then gathered together,  
 “ having no other arms than sticks tipped with  
 “ iron, and knives, and immediately proceeded  
 “ to the neighbouring mansion of a nobleman.  
 “ After having murdered him, his wife and chil-  
 “ dren, not sparing the infant babes, they set fire  
 “ to his house. They then proceeded to another  
 “ castle, where seizing on the Chevalier, they of-  
 “ fered

“fered violence to his wife and daughter, and af-  
 “terwards murdered them in his presence, with  
 “the rest of his children; they then butchered  
 “him, and levelled his castle with the ground.  
 “They treated several other country houses and  
 “castles in the same manner. Their numbers in-  
 “creased to six thousand, and they were joined  
 “every where as they went by their equals; the  
 “others fled through terror, carrying their wives  
 “and children with them to the distance of ten or  
 “twenty leagues, leaving their houses and valu-  
 “ables at the mercy of the robbers. These wicked  
 “wretches, without chiefs, buffeted, burnt, and  
 “massacred every nobleman they met with, and  
 “offered the most unheard-of violences to the  
 “wives and daughters of their victims. He who  
 “committed the greatest excesses and horrors  
 “(deeds that neither can nor ought to be described)  
 “was the most exalted among them, and looked  
 “upon as the most distinguished leader. I could  
 “not dare recite the treatment which women  
 “met with from them. Among other horrors  
 “which they committed, they seized a noble-  
 “man, murdered him, spitted him, and roasted  
 “him in the presence of his wife and children \*.  
 “They

\* When the unfortunate Chevalier Dillon was murdered by  
 his own soldiers at Lisle, after having made him languish from  
 nine in the morning till seven at night with a broken thigh  
 from



“ They forced this unhappy woman to eat of the  
 “ flesh of her husband, and then made her under-  
 “ go a most shocking death.

“ These wicked wretches burnt and destroyed  
 “ above sixty castles in the Beauvoisin and in the  
 “ neighbourhood of Corbie, Amiens, and Mont-  
 “ didier. They destroyed above a hundred in  
 “ the county of Valois, and the bishopricks of  
 “ Laon, Noyon, and Soissons \*.”

It is worthy of remark, that when these wretches  
 were asked what induced them to commit such  
 horrors, they answered, ‘That they did not know.’  
 Such was the precise answer which our first incen-  
 diaries gave when asked why they burned the  
 castles; such also would have been the answer of  
 our Transilvanian Carmagnoles. Whence did that

from a pistol ball which one of the cuirassiers under his com-  
 mand had fired at him in the field. As he entered the gates  
 of Lisle he received three more shots, which put an end to his  
 existence, and his body was dragged to the *Grande Place*, where  
 it was roasted, and pieces of his flesh sold for two-pence and three-  
 pence to the standers-by. On the 11th of August, I was eye-  
 witness to the burning of the bodies of many of the Swiss in  
 large bonfires, made of the wood-work of the guard-houses  
 and out-houses of the Thuilleries, while men covered with  
 blood and smoke were beating down with long poles the  
 flesh which bloated up from the heat. Large piles of burnt  
 bones lay by the fires, which had been kindled soon after the  
 attack upon the palace the day before, which proved that such  
 had been their amusement during the preceding night. T.

\* Froissard's Chronicle, Ed. of Lyons 1559, Chap. 182.

VOL. II,

S

clown

clown who became their chief procure his star and his patents written in golden letters? Who had forged them, if not the same sect that in 1789 forged the pretended orders of Lewis XVI. sent to the peasantry in Dauphiné to burn the castles and chase the nobles? The pretext was every where the same, and the like evils flowed from the same, though *bidden, source*.

Besides, there is a most terrible cloud impending over this insurrection of the peasantry in Transilvania against the nobility. In the commencement the government of Hermanstadt refused to send succours on pretence that their alarms were groundless, when it was impossible to deny the horrors committed by the insurgents. Soldiers were sent, but without orders to act. At first appearance one would have thought they were in an understanding with the banditti, who continued their devastations without fearing to be repressed by the soldiery. The troops, having no orders, were reduced to be tranquil spectators of the castles in flames (the incendiaries even marching before them), and heard the unhappy victims calling for succour in the agonies of death, but in vain; they had not the power to act. At length such of the nobles as had escaped the general massacre, being joined by those of the neighbouring counties, formed themselves into a body, marched against the insurgents, and defeated them in various

fious encounters; and Horja, with his followers who were still numerous, was obliged to retire into the mountains. He there gathered fresh forces, and renewed his devastating and sanguinary course. Then at least it was impossible not to give the troops orders to act. But the cloud becomes still more impenetrable. When the insurgents pillaged Abrud-Banga the *Caisse d'Escompte* belonging to the Royal Chamber fell into their hands; but they would not touch it because it belonged to the Emperor: And soon after a detachment of a Lieutenant and only *twenty-four* men came to escort the chest to Zalatna. On their march a numerous party of Horja's followers might have seized it again, when one of the insurgents advancing proposed a parly between their Chief and the Lieutenant. The Chief advanced, saying, "We are not to be considered as rebels. " "We love and adore the Emperor in whose service we are. Our sole object is to throw off " the tyrannical yoke of the nobility, which we " can bear no longer. Go and tell the Officers " of the Chamber of Zalatna, that they have no " thing to fear from us."

Notwithstanding the fidelity with which they adhered to their promise, it was necessary to order the troops to act; and in various encounters many prisoners were made from the insurgents. I could wish that it had fallen to my task to praise the ge-

nerosity of the nobility on this occasion. But my Historian accuses them of having cruelly revenged themselves on a multitude of unhappy persons, who had only joined the revolvers through compulsion. A cruel Magistrate condemned them all indiscriminately, and in such numbers, that an Austrian Major threatened to make him responsible to the Emperor for all the innocent blood which he had spilt.

This harsh treatment of the prisoners stimulated Horja and his followers to new cruelties against the nobility. He intrenched himself again in the mountains, and they in vain offered him a general amnesty. He was beginning to renew his depredations the following year, when he was taken by a stratagem. The insurgents, disconcerted, craved peace, and laid down their arms.

Such was the conclusion of a conspiracy, which was no more than an essay made in those distant provinces by the Sophisters of Liberty and Equality of what they were contriving elsewhere, to level every head which towered above the vulgar. The apparent cause, and which might have greatly contributed in reality, was the excessive abuse of their rights and the oppression over their vassals exercised by the nobility of Transilvania. The tone of moderation and veracity with which the relation we have followed is written, leaves no room to doubt of these oppressions; and in that point

point of view this terrible insurrection would be foreign to the object of our memoirs. But the insurrection of the negroes may also be attributed to the harshness of the treatment they underwent ; yet it is nevertheless universally known, that all the atrocious crimes and barbarities committed by the insurgent slaves against their masters at St. Domingo, Martinico, and Guadaloupe, are to be traced to the plots combined by the levelling Sophisters in Paris.

It is precisely in a similar light that the insurrection in Transilvania is represented in a narrative which we received from a person who was more in the way of observing the progress of Philosophism in Vienna and the other Austrian dominions. He was acquainted with their plots, he refuted the pretences, and foresaw the fatal consequences ; he even more than once declared them to the Austrian government ; but he was not more hearkened to than many others whose words have been but too fatally verified by the horrid Revolution.

In the memoirs of this accurate observer on the insurrection of Transilvania, I see him combine the efforts of our modern Sophisters with those of a sect long since lurking in the Occult Lodges of Free-masonry.

At the epoch we are now describing such indeed was the union between the Sophisters and the Craft, and such was the mutual succour which they

lent to each other, that it was impossible to develop the progress of the one without seeking the origin of the other, without exposing their common hatreds and common systems, and the combinations of their mutual plots into one and the same conspiracy against Christ and his altars, against *Kings* and their thrones. Our object therefore in the remaining chapters will be, to reveal the mysteries of Free-masonry, to explain the means and success it afforded to the modern Sophisters in the French Revolution, and to show how fatal their union has already been, and how much it threatens the social order of the whole world.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the General Secret, or Lesser Mysteries, of  
Free-masonry.*

IN treating of Free-masonry truth and justice rigorously compel us to begin with an exception that exculpates the greater part of those brethren who have been initiated, and who would have conceived a just horror for this association, had they been able to foresee that it could ever make them contract obligations which militated against the duties of the religious man and of the true citizen.

Distinctions and exceptions to be made among the Freemasons.

England in particular is full of those upright men, who, excellent Citizens, and of all stations, are proud of being Masons, and who may be distinguished from the others by ties which only appear to unite them more closely in the bonds of charity and fraternal affection. It is not the fear of offending a nation in which I have found an asylum that has suggested this exception. Gratitude on the contrary would silence every vain terror, and I should be seen exclaiming in the very streets of London that England was lost, that it could not escape the French Revolution, if its Free-mason

Of English Masons.

Lodges were similar to those of which I am about to treat. I would say more, that Christianity and all government would have long been at an end in England, if it could be even supposed that her Masons were initiated into the last mysteries of the sect. Long since have their Lodges been sufficiently numerous to execute such a design, had the English Masons adopted either the means or the plans and plots of the Occult Lodges.

This argument alone might suffice to except the English Masons in general from what I have to say of the sect. But there exist many passages in the history of Masonry which necessitate this exception. The following appears convincing.—At the time when the Illuminés of Germany, the most detestable of the Jacobin crew, were seeking to strengthen their party by that of Masonry, they affected a sovereign contempt for the English Lodges. In the letters of Philo to Spartacus we see the English adepts arriving in Germany from London dawbed all over with the ribbands and emblems of their degrees, but void of those plans and projects against the altar and the crown which tend directly to the point. When I shall have given the history of these Illuminés the reader will easily judge what immense weight such a testimony carries with it, in favour of the English Lodges. It is glorious for them to see themselves despised by  
the



the most unrelenting enemies of the altar, of the throne, and of all society \*.

For a considerable length of time a similar exception might have been made of the generality of Lodges both in France and Germany. Some of them not only published protestations, but receded from Masonry as soon as they perceived it to be infected by those revolutionary principles which the Illuminés had infused among the brethren †. In short the number of exceptions to be made for upright Masons is beyond the conception of those who are not thoroughly acquainted with the principles and proceedings of the sect.—In fact, how is it possible to conceive, that in so numerous an association, where its members are united by bonds and oaths to which they are most religiously attached, so very few of its adepts should be acquainted with the grand object of the association itself? This enigma would have been easily understood had we published (as we hope to do) the history of ancient Jacobinism with that of the middle age, before we had digested these memoirs of modern Jacobinism. But to supply this deficiency, and to methodize our ideas on this famous association, we will begin by treating of

Exceptions with respect to other countries.

\* See letter of Philo to Spartacus.

† See the speech of a Master pronounced in a Bavarian Lodge.

the

the secret which is common to all the degrees, that is to say, of what may be called the lesser mysteries; and thence proceeding to the secret and doctrine of the Occult Lodges, we will treat of the grand mysteries of Masonry. We will also treat of its origin and of its propagation; in fine, of its coalition with the conspiring Sophisters, and of the means it afforded them of executing their plans against the altar and the throne.

The general secret discovered by the Masons themselves.

Until the 12th of August 1792, the French Jacobins had only dated the annals of their Revolution by the years of their pretended *Liberty*. On that day Lewis XVI. who had been declared forty-eight hours before to have forfeited his right to the crown, was carried prisoner to the Tower of the Temple (so called because it formerly belonged to the Knights Templars). On that day the rebel assembly decreed, that to the date of *Liberty*, the date of *Equality* should be added in future in all public acts, and the decree itself was dated the fourth year of *Liberty*, the first year and first day of *Equality*.

It was on that day, for the first time, that the secret of Free-masonry was made public; that secret so dear to them, and which they preserved with all the solemnity of the most inviolable oath. At the reading of this famous decree, they exclaimed, 'We have at length succeeded, and France is no other than an immense lodge. The whole  
French

French people are Free-masons, and the whole universe will soon follow their example.'

I witnessed this enthusiasm, I heard the conversations to which it give rise. I saw Masons, till then the most reserved, who freely and openly declared, "Yes, at length the grand object of Free-masonry is accomplished, EQUALITY and LIBERTY; *all men are equal and brothers; all men are free.* That was the whole substance of our doctrine, the object of our wishes, THE WHOLE of our GRAND SECRET." Such was the language I heard fall from the most zealous Masons, from those whom I have seen decorated with all the insignia of the deepest Masonry, and who enjoyed the rights of *Venerable* to preside over Lodges. I have heard them express themselves in this manner before those whom Masons would call *the profane*, without requiring the smallest secrecy either from the men or women present. They said it in a tone as if they wished all France should be acquainted with this glorious achievement of Masonry; as if it were to recognize in them its benefactors and the authors of that Revolution of *Liberty and Equality* of which it had given so grand an example to all Europe.

Such in reality was the general secret of the Free-masons. It was similar to what in the games of the ancients were called the lesser mysteries, common to all degrees; and though the word expressed the

the whole, it was not wholly understood by all.— Its progressive explanation, while it renders it innocent in some, renders it monstrous in others.— In the mean time, before we have accounted for this difference, let not the Mason, whatever may be his degree, inculcate us if as in *Paris this famous secret ceases to continue one*. Too many of the prophane were acquainted with it in that Revolutionary country, for it to remain a secret in others. Even those in England who may still wish to keep it, will vainly object that we have been misled; they will soon see whether it was possible for us to be so. Were we destitute of other evidence, we might safely assert, that those Masons did not mislead us, who were actuated by no other passion than that of the glory of the sect when they revealed those mysteries which when secure of their execution ceased to be mysterious. Those again did not mislead us, who, formerly initiated into those mysteries, at length owned that they had been dupes: That all that Liberty and Equality which they had treated as mere play had already proved a most desperate game for their country, and might bring ruin on the whole universe. And I have met with many of these adepts since the Revolution, both in France and elsewhere, who had formerly been zealous Masons, but latterly confessing with bitterness this fatal secret, which reduces the whole science of Masonry;  
like

like the French Revolution, to these two words *Liberty and Equality*.

I once more conjure the upright Masons not to look upon themselves as accused of wishing to establish a similar Revolution. When I shall have verified this article of their doctrine, the essence and the basis of all their mysteries, I will show how it came to pass that so many noble and virtuous characters were initiated without even suspecting the ultimate design. But for the history of the Revolution, it is necessary that the most distant doubt should not subsist as to this *fundamental secret*. If this were not made clear, it would be impossible for the reader to comprehend the help which the Sophisters of Rebellion and Impiety acquired from Masonry. I shall therefore seek Other proofs of the secret: other proofs beside these avowals, which many others must have heard like me from the adepts, since their successes in France had made them regard secrecy in future as superfluous.

Antecedent to these avowals, there was an easy method of discovering that Liberty and Equality were the grand objects of Masonry. The very name of *Free-mason* carries with it the idea of Liberty; as to *Equality* it was disguised under the term *Fraternity*, which has nearly a similar signification. But who has not heard the Mason brag of the Equality which reigned in their Lodges, where Princes and Nobles, the rich and the poor,  
all

all were *equal*, all were brothers: That distinctions of rank no longer existed when once passed the Tyler \* ; and that the sole appellation used among them was that of Brother, the only name also which gives us an idea of perfect Equality.

It is true, that it was expressly forbidden to any Mason ever to write these two words *Liberty and Equality* consecutively, or give the least hint that their secret resided in the union of these two grand principles; and that law was so exactly observed by their writers, that I do not remember ever to have seen it transgressed among the numerous volumes which I have read, though of the most secret sort, on the different degrees. Mirabeau himself, when he pretended to reveal the secrets of Masonry, only dared reveal them in part. The order of Free-masonry, which is spread all over the world, he says, has for its objects, Charity, *Equality of Stations*, and perfect harmony †.— Though *this Equality of Stations* seems pretty well to denote the Liberty which must exist in this Equality, still Mirabeau, who was a Mason himself, knew that the time was not yet come, when his brethren would pardon him for avowing that in these two words consisted their general secret;

\* The Officer standing at the door with a drawn sword to receive the sign, and admit only the real Members.

† Essay on the Illuminés, Chap. 15.

but

but this very reservedness sufficiently denotes how much both the one and the other were held precious in their mysteries. If we refer to the hymns and songs sung in chorus at their festivals, we shall generally find some verses or stanza in honour of Liberty or of Equality \*. In the same way we may often remark either the one or the other to be the subject of the discourses they have pronounced, and which are sometimes printed.

Were I even deprived of these proofs, still it would be incumbent on me to declare what personal knowledge I may have acquired.

Though I have seen so many Masons who since the famous decree of *Equality* have spoken in the most open manner of this famous secret (though the oath which they had taken should have made them more reserved on it than me, who never took any oath either in their Lodges, or to the Revolution of Liberty and Equality), I should nevertheless be perfectly silent on all that I have wit-

\* It is for this reason, that amidst all their encomiums on benevolence, which is the chief object of their songs, we see the English always add some lines in the sense of the following :

Masons have long been free,  
And may they ever be, &c.  
Princes and Kings our brothers are, &c.

These lines, however, notwithstanding their tendency to Liberty and Equality, are not to be understood in a Jacobinal light in the mouth of an English Mason.

nessed,

nessed, were I not thoroughly convinced how much it imported all nations, to be acquainted with the ultimate tendency of Masonry. I should be sorry to see thousands of upright Masons, especially in England, take offence at the discovery of their secret; but such virtuous and upright men are not those who would prefer the vain-glory of their secret to the public welfare, or to the proper precautions to be taken against the abuses of Masonry; in a word against an abominable sect who, under the pretence of virtue, wish to mislead the universe. I shall speak openly and without the fear of displeasing those Masons whom I esteem and revere; and shall but little trouble myself about the displeasure of others whose persons I condemn and whose plots I abhor.

The Author admitted to the Lodges, and how?

During the last twenty years it was difficult, especially in Paris, to meet persons who did not belong to the society of Masonry. I was acquainted with many, and some were my intimate friends. These, with all that zeal common to young adepts, frequently pressed me to become one of their brotherhood. As I constantly refused, they undertook to enroll me notwithstanding my refusal.—The plan settled, I was invited to dinner at a friend's house and was the only prophane in the midst of a large party of Masons. Dinner over and the servants ordered to withdraw, it was proposed to form themselves into a Lodge, and to initiate



tiate me. I persisted in my refusal, and particularly refused to take the oath of keeping a secret, the very object of which was unknown to me. They dispensed with the oath, but I still refused. They became more pressing, telling me that Masonry was perfectly innocent, and that its morality was unobjectionable: In reply, I asked whether it was better than that of the Gospel. They only answered by forming themselves into a Lodge, when began all those grimaces and childish ceremonies which are described in books of Masonry, such as Jachin and Boaz. I attempted to make my escape, but in vain; the apartment was very extensive, the house in a retired situation, the servants in the secret, and all the doors locked. I am questioned, and answer most of the questions laughing. I am received *Apprentice*, and immediately after *Fellow-craft*. Having received these two degrees, I was informed that a third was to be conferred on me. On this I am conducted into a large room. There the scene changes, and takes a more serious appearance. And though they dispensed with my undergoing all the more toilsome tests, they nevertheless were not sparing in a multitude of tiresome and insignificant questions.

On finding myself obliged to go through this farce, I had taken care to say, that since they had

VOL. II.

T

cut

cut off every means of retreat, I was forced to submit; but that, if I perceived any thing either against honour or conscience, they should soon find with whom they had to deal.

As yet I had only perceived a mere childish play and burlesque ceremonies, in spite of all the gravity which the brethren affected; but I had given no offence by any of my answers. At length the Venerable with the utmost gravity put the following question: "Brother, are you disposed to execute all the orders of the Grand-Master, though you were to receive contrary orders from a King, an Emperor, or any other Sovereign whatever?" My answer was "*No.*"—"What *No.*," replies the Venerable with surprize! "Are you only entered among us to betray our secrets! Would you hesitate between the interests of Masonry and those of the profane?"—"You are not aware then that there is not one of our swords but is ready to pierce the heart of a traitor." Notwithstanding the gravity with which this question was put, and the menaces which accompanied it, I could not persuade myself that he was in earnest; but I still continued to answer in the negative, and replied, as may easily be imagined, "That it was rather extraordinary to suppose that I who had only been brought in by force could ever have come there in order

" to

“ to betray the secrets of Masonry. You talk of  
 “ secrets, and you have told me none. If in  
 “ order to be initiated I must promise to obey a  
 “ man that I know not, and if the interests of  
 “ Masonry can be a bar to any part of my duty,  
 “ good day to you Gentlemen. It is not too late  
 “ as yet. I know nothing of your mysteries, nor  
 “ do I wish to know more of them.”

This answer did not disconcert the Venerable in the least, and he continued to act his part perfectly well; he pressed me more earnestly, and renewed his threats. I certainly believed the whole to be a farce; but even in joke I would not promise obedience to their Grand Master, especially on the supposition that his commands could ever be contrary to those of the Sovereign. I replied once more, “ Gentlemen, or Brethren, I told you before, that if there was any thing in your games  
 “ either against honor or conscience, you should  
 “ learn whom you had to deal with. We are now  
 “ come to the point. You may do what you  
 “ please with me, but you shall never make me  
 “ assent to such a proposition; and once more I  
 “ say *No*.”

Every one kept the most profound silence except the Venerable, though they were much amused with the scene. It at length grew more serious between the Venerable and me. He would

T 2

not

not give up the point, and, renewing his question over and over again, he was in hopes, by tiring my patience, to extort a Yes. At length I found myself quite wearied out. I was blindfold, I tore off the bandage, threw it upon the ground, and stamping with my foot, called out No, with every sign of impatience. Immediately the whole Lodge clap their hands in sign of applause, and the Venerable compliments me on my constancy. "Such are the men for us, men of resolution and courage."—"What," said I, "men of resolution! And how many do you find who resist your threats! You yourselves, gentlemen, have not you all said Yes to this question: and if you have said it, how is it possible that you can persuade me that your mysteries contain nothing against honor or conscience."

The tone I assumed had thrown the Lodge into confusion. The brethren surrounded me, telling me I had taken things too much in earnest, and in too literal a sense: that they never had pretended to engage in any thing contrary to the duties of every true Frenchman, and that in spite of all my resistance I should nevertheless be admitted. The Venerable soon restored order with a few strokes of his mallet. He then informed me that I was passed to the degree of *Master*, adding, that if the secret was not given to me, it was only because a  
more

more regular lodge, and held with the ordinary ceremonies, was necessary on such an occasion. In the mean while he gave me the signs and the pass words for the third degree, as he had done for the other two. This was sufficient to enable me to be admitted into a regular Lodge, and now we were all brethren. As for me, I had been metamorphosed into *apprentice*, *fellow-craft*, and *master* in one evening, without having ever dreamt of it in the morning.

I was too well acquainted with those who had received me, not to believe their protestation sincere, when they declared that they had never pretended to engage in any thing contrary to their duty. And in justice I am bound to declare, that, excepting the Venerable, who turned out a violent Jacobin, they all showed themselves loyal subjects at the Revolution. I promised to be present at a regular meeting, provided the oath was never mentioned to me. They promised that it never should be insisted on, and they kept their words. They only requested that I would inscribe my name on the list, that it might be sent to the Grand Lodge of the East. I refused again, and asked time to consider of it; and when I had sufficiently attended to see what these Lodges were I retired, without even consenting to inscribe my name.

T 3

On

On my first appearance in a regular Lodge, I was quit for a fine speech on Masonry, of which I knew but little at that time, so chiefly dwelt upon fraternity, and on the pleasure of living with brethren.

They had agreed on that day to receive an apprentice, who was to have the secret given him with all the ordinary forms, in order that I might learn it, though only a spectator. It would be useless to swell this chapter by describing the ceremonial and the trials on such occasions. In the first degrees, they appear to be nothing more than a childish play. I may refer my readers to the Key of Masonry (*La Clef de Maçons*) or to the Free-masons Catechism, and some other books of the sort, which are perfectly exact as to the ceremonial of the three degrees which I received and saw conferred upon others, excepting in some very small points of no consequence.

The grand object for me was to learn the famous secret of Masonry. The moment at length comes when the postulant is ordered to approach nearer to the Venerable. Then the brethren who had been armed with swords for the occasion drawing up in two lines held their swords elevated, leaning the points toward each other, and formed what in Masonry is called the *arch of steel*. The candidate passes under this arch to a sort of altar elevated

elevated on two steps, at the farthest end of the Lodge. The Master, seated in an arm chair, or a sort of throne, behind this altar, pronounced a long discourse on the inviolability of the secret which was to be imparted, and on the danger of breaking the oath which the candidate was going to take. He pointed to the naked swords which were always ready to pierce the breast of the traitor, and declared to him that it was impossible to escape their vengeance. The candidate then swears, "that rather than betray the secret, he consents to have his head cut off, his heart and entrails torn out, and his ashes cast before the wind." Having taken the oath the Master said the following words to him, which the reader may easily conceive have not escaped my memory, as I had expected them with so much impatience, "My dear brother, the secret of Masonry consists in these words, EQUALITY AND LIBERTY; *all men are equal and free; all men are brethren.*" The Master did not utter another syllable, and every body embraced the new *brother equal and free*. The Lodge broke up, and we gayly adjourned to a Masonic repast.

I was so far from suspecting any further meaning in this famous secret, that I could scarcely refrain from bursting into a fit of laughter on hearing it, and with the greatest simplicity told those who had

T 4

intro-

introduced me, If that was all their secret, I had known it a long time.

And certainly there was no occasion for being a mason to learn that man is not born for slavery, but to enjoy a *true Liberty* under the empire of the laws ; or if they understand *by Equality* that as we are the children of one common parent, the creatures of the same God, we are to love and help each other as brethren ; such truths certainly are better taught in the Gospel than by the childish rites of Masonry. I must say, that though the Lodge was numerously attended, I did not see a single craftsman who gave any other interpretation to this famous secret. The reader will see that it was necessary to go through many other degrees before they were initiated into a very different Liberty and Equality, and even that many who rose to higher degrees were never initiated into the ultimate sense of their famous secret.

Let not people be surprized that English Masonry should be chiefly composed of good and loyal subjects, whose main object is mutually to help each other on the principles of Equality, which with them is nothing more than Fraternity. Few English craftsmen are acquainted with more than the three first degrees already mentioned ; and the reader may rest assured, that with the exception of the imprudent question on obedience to the  
Grand



Grand Master of the Order, there is nothing which can render the secret dangerous, were it not for the Jacobin interpretation. The English good sense has banished such an explanation. I have even heard of a resolution taken by some of the chief craftsmen, of rejecting all those who might seek to introduce the revolutionary liberty among them. I have read most excellent discourses and lectures on the avoiding of abuses, in the history of their Masonry. I have there seen the Grand Master telling the brethren that the true Equality of the craft, does not authorize the brother when out of the Lodge to derogate from that respect and deference due to the rank which any person bears in the world, or their different political degrees and titles. I have also remarked in the secret instructions of the Grand Master many excellent lectures to conciliate the Liberty and Equality of the craft, with fidelity and submission to the laws, in short, with all the duties of a loyal subject \*. Hence it arises, that though the English have every thing in common with the craft of other nations, as far as the degree of Master inclusive; though they have the same secret, the same word, and the same signs to know each other by, yet as they generally stop at this degree, they never are ini-

\* See the 1st part of the History of English Masonry.

tiated

tiated into the grand mysteries; or we should perhaps be more correct, if we said they had rejected them. They have found means of purifying Masonry. We shall soon see how little these grand mysteries could agree with the character of a nation which has given so many proofs of its wisdom.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. X.

*Of the Grand Mysteries or Secrets of the  
Occult Lodges.*

WE comprehend under the designation of Occult Lodges, or the higher degrees of Masonry, all Free-masons in general who, after having past the first three degrees of *Apprentice, Fellowcraft,* and *Master*, show sufficient zeal to be admitted into the higher degrees, where the veil is rent asunder, where emblematical and allegorical figures are thrown aside, and where the twofold principle of Liberty and Equality is unequivocally explained *by war against Christ and his Altars, war against Kings and their Thrones!!!* In demonstrating that such is the result of the grand mysteries of the Craft, it will not be the want, but the multiplicity of proofs that will embarrass us. These alone would fill a large volume, and we wish to comprize them in this chapter. The reader will at least dispense with the emblems, oaths, ceremonies, and trials which are peculiar to each of these higher degrees. To show their last object and to develop their doctrine is the essential point, and what we shall always have in view. We shall begin by

Object of  
these  
mysteries,

general

general observations, which will enable the reader to follow these mysteries more accurately, according as they are explained.

General  
reasons  
for mis-  
trusting  
these  
mysteries.

Notwithstanding that in the first degrees of Masonry every thing appears to partake of puerile inventions, they nevertheless contain many things which the sect have thrown out, merely to observe the impression which they made on the young adepts, and to judge from thence to what lengths they may be led.

1st. It declares the grand object it has in view to be at one time, *the raising of temples to virtue, and the excavating of dungeons for vice*; at another, to bring the adepts *to light*, and deliver them from the darkness with which the *prophane* are encompassed; and by the *prophane* are understood the remainder of the universe. This promise is contained in the first Catechism of the Craft, and none will deny it. Nevertheless, this promise alone sufficiently indicates that the Craft acknowledge a morality and teach a doctrine which brands Christ and his Gospel with error and darkness.

2dly. The Masonic and Christian æra do not coincide. *The year of Light* dates with them from the first days of the creation: This again is what no Mason will deny. But that custom clearly demonstrates that their *lights*, their *morality*, and their *religious doctrines*, are anterior to the Evangelical

gelical Revelation, or even to Moses and the Prophets; they will, in short, be whatever incredulity may please to style the Religion of Nature.

3dly. In the Masonic language, all their Lodges are but one temple representing the whole universe; the temple which extends from the *East to the West, from the South to the North*. They admit into this temple with equal indifference the Christian or the Jew, the Turk or the Idolater, in fine, without distinction of sect or religion. All equally behold the *light*, all learn the science of virtue, of real happiness, and all may remain members of the Craft, and rise in its degrees up to that where they are taught that all religious tenets are but errors and prejudices. Though many Masons may view this re-union in no other light than that of universal charity and benevolence, which ought to extend to all mankind, whether Jew, Gentile, Idolater, or Christian, it is nevertheless much to be feared, that this re-union of error and falsehood only tends to infuse an indifference for all religious tenets into the minds of the adepts, as a preparatory step to the denial of all in the higher degrees.

4thly. It is always under the most dreadful oaths of secrecy, that the Free-masons communicate their pretended lights or their art of building temples to virtue, and dungeons for vice. When both truth and virtue had every thing to fear from the reigning

Object of the mysteries proved by the nature of the degrees. ing tyrants, it may be conceived that they taught their lessons in private ; but, so far from exacting an oath of secrecy, they condemned silence as criminal when their lessons could be made public, and commanded that what had been learned under the shadow of the night should be preached openly at noon day. Either the doctrines of the Craft are conformable to the laws of Christianity, to the peace of states, and conducive to virtue and happiness (and then what has it had to fear from Kings and Pontiffs since Christianity was established) ? Or, their pretended science is in opposition to the religion and the laws of the Christian world (and then we have only to say, that the evil doer seeks to hide himself).

5thly. Most certainly the Free-masons do not make a secret of what is praise-worthy in their associations. It is not that fraternal affection for their neighbour which they hide, and which they only have in common with every religious observer of the gospel. Neither do they make a secret of the sweets of that convivial Equality which accompanies their meetings and their fraternal repasts. On the contrary, they are perpetually extolling their benevolence, and nobody is ignorant of the conviviality of their regales. Their secret must therefore contain something widely different from this fraternity, and something less innocent than the mirth of the Masonic table.

Such

Such language in general might have been held to all Masons; such reasonings might have made them suspect that the higher degrees of their association contained mysteries which it was far more interested in hiding, than their fraternity, their signs, and pass-words. That affected secrecy on the first principles of Masonry, *Liberty* and *Equality*, the oath never to reveal that such was the basis of their doctrines, premised that there existed such an explanation of these words as the sect was interested in hiding both from the state and church. And in reality it was to attain to this explanation of the last mysteries that so many trials, oaths, and degrees were necessary.

To convince the reader how much these surmises are realized in the Occult Lodges, it is necessary for us to go back to the degree of Master, and relate the allegorical story of which the successive explanations and interpretations form the profound mysteries of the higher degrees.

In this degree of Master-mason the Lodge is hung round with black. In the middle is a coffin covered with a pall: the brethren standing round it in attitudes denoting sorrow and revenge. When the new adept is admitted, the Master relates to him the following history or fable.

“ Adoniram presided over the payment of the workmen who were building the temple by Solomon's orders. They were three thousand workmen.

Allegorical history of Adoniram, the foundation of all these decrees.

men. That each one might receive his due, Adoniram divided them into three classes, Apprentices, Fellow-crafts, and Masters. He entrusted each class with a word, signs, and a gripe, by which they might be recognized. Each class was to preserve the greatest secrecy as to these signs and words. Three of the Fellow-crafts, wishing to know the word, and by that means obtain the salary, of Master, hid themselves in the temple, and each posted himself at a different gate. At the usual time when Adoniram came to shut the gates of the temple, the first of the three met him, and demanded the *word of the masters*; Adoniram refused to give it, and received a violent blow with a stick on his head. He flies to another gate, is met, challenged, and treated in a similar manner by the second: flying to the third door he is killed by the Fellow-craft posted there, on his refusing to betray the word. His assassins buried him under a heap of rubbish, and marked the spot with a branch of Acacia.

Adoniram's absence gave great uneasiness to Solomon and the Masters: He is sought for every where: at length one of the Masters discovers the corpse, and, taking it by the finger, the finger parted from the hand; he took it by the wrist, and it parted from the arm; when the Master, in astonishment, cried out *Mac Benac*, which the Craft interprets by "*the flesh parts from the bones.*"

Left



Lest Adoniram should have revealed the *word*, the Masters convened and agreed to change it, and to substitute the words *Mac Benac*; sacred words, that Free-masons dare not pronounce out of the Lodges; and there each only pronounces one syllable, leaving his neighbour to pronounce the other.

The history finished, the adept is informed, that the object of the degree he has just received is to recover the word lost by the death of Adoniram, and to revenge this martyr of the Masonic secrecy\*. The generality of Masons, looking upon this history as no more than a fable, and the ceremonies as puerile, give themselves very little trouble in searching farther into these mysteries.

These sports, however, assume a more serious aspect when we arrive at the degree of Elect (*Elu*). Degree of  
Elect. This degree is subdivided into two parts; the first has the revenging of Adoniram for its object, the other to recover the *word*, or rather the sacred doctrine which it expressed, and which has been lost.

In this degree of Elect, all the brethren appear dressed in black, wearing a breast-piece on the left side, on which is embroidered a death's head, a bone, and a poniard, encircled by the motto of *Conquer or die*. The same motto is embroidered on

\* See the degree of Master in the Works on Masonry.

a ribband which they wear in saltier. Every thing breathes death and revenge. The candidate is led into the Lodge blind-folded, with bloody gloves on his hands. An adept with a poniard in his hand threatens to run him through the heart for the crime with which he is accused. After various frights, he obtains his life, on condition that he will revenge the father of Masonry in the death of his assassin. He is shown to a dark cavern. He is to penetrate into it, and they call to him, Strike all that shall oppose you; enter, defend yourself, and avenge our Master; at that price you shall receive the degree of Elect. A poniard in his right hand, a lamp in his left, he proceeds; a phantom opposes his passage, he hears the same voice repeat, Strike, avenge Hiram, there is his assassin. He strikes and the blood flows.—Strike off his head the voice repeats, and the head of the corpse is lying at his feet. He seizes it by the hair\*, and triumphantly carries it back as a proof of his victory; shows it to each of the brethren, and is judged worthy of the new degree.

I have questioned divers Masons whether this apprenticeship to ferocity and murder had never given them the idea, that the head to be cut off was that of Kings, and they candidly owned that

\* The reader may easily conceive, that this corpse is no more than a mannikin containing bladders full of blood.

the

the idea had never struck them until the Revolution had convinced them of the fact.

It was the same with respect to the religious part 2d Part. of this degree, where the adept is at once Pontiff and Sacrificer with the rest of the brethren. Vested in the ornaments of the priesthood, they offer bread and wine, according to the order of Melchisedec. The secret object of this ceremony is to re-establish religious Equality, and to exhibit all men equally Priests and Pontiffs, to recall the brethren to natural religion, and to persuade them that the religion of Moses and of Christ had violated religious Liberty and Equality by the distinction of Priests and Laity. It was the Revolution again which opened the eyes of many of the adepts, who then owned that they had been dupes to this impiety, as they had been to the regicide essay in the former part \*.

These

\* Were we less rigorous as to our proofs, we should treat in this place of the degree called the *Knights of the Sun*. But we are only acquainted with it through the medium of the *Voile Levé (the veil raised up)* a work of the Abbé Le Franc, certainly a man of the greatest virtue and undoubted veracity, and one of those excellent Ecclesiastics who preferred falling under the butchering poniards of the Septembrizers, to betraying their religion. But this author has neglected to inform us from what sources he had drawn his documents on the Masonic degrees. Beside, we can remark, that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the origin of Masonry, which he

U 2

only

The  
higher  
degrees  
of Scotch  
Masonry.

These mysteries are not sufficiently explained in the degree of Elect for all to comprehend them. The generality of Masons initiated in this degree give

only traces back to Socinus: His knowledge also of the Scotch degrees appears to have been acquired from inaccurate translations, which our French authors had vitiated according to their respective purposes.

On the other side, we know for certain, that this degree of *Knight of the Sun* is a modern creation. Its author is to be known by his Teutonic style. If we are to believe what we have been told, it owes its origin to one of those Philosophists of very high life, who was too much attached to the high rank which he enjoyed, to adopt any other Equality than that which applied to the Masonic feasts and their impiety. And nothing is to be found in this degree which militates against the throne. It is much too perspicuous for many Masons, who would have been disgusted with any thing but emblematical figures susceptible of various explanations. Nevertheless, we were acquainted with several of these *Knights of the Sun* in France. This degree was only given to such of the adepts whose impiety was unequivocal. It was rather a degree of modern Philosophism than of ancient Masonry. Under that point of view it is worthy of notice; but we only give the following account as an extract from the Abbé Le Franc's work.

When initiated into this higher degree, it was no longer possible for the adept to dissemble with himself how incompatible the Masonic code was with the slightest remnant of Christianity. Here the Master of the Lodge is styled *Adam*, whilst the introducer takes the name of *Veritas* (*Truth*). The following are part of the lectures which brother *Veritas* repeats to

give themselves little trouble to understand the real signification of them; and as long as they have any sentiments of religion or attachment to their Prince,

to the new adept while recapitulating all the allegories which he has seen in the former parts of Masonry.

“ Learn in the first place that the three implements with which you have been made acquainted—the Bible, the Compasses, and the Square, have a secret signification unknown to you. By the Bible you are to understand that you are to acknowledge no other law than that of Adam, the law which the Almighty had engraved on his heart, and *that is what is called the LAW OF NATURE.*—The Compass recalls to your mind, that God is the central point of every thing, from which every thing is equally distant, and to which every thing is equally near.—By the Square we learn, that God has made every *thing equal*—The Cubic Stone, that *all your actions are equal with respect to the sovereign good.*—The death of Hiram, and the change of the Master’s word, teach you, that it is difficult to escape the snares of ignorance, but that it is your duty to show the same courage as our Master Hiram, who suffered himself to be massacred rather than hearken to the persuasions of his assassins.”

The most essential part of this discourse is the explanation which Brother *Veritas* gives of the degree of Elect. Amongst others we read the following lines :

“ If you ask me what are the necessary qualities to enable a Mason to arrive at the centre of real perfection? I shall answer, that in order to attain it, he must have crushed the head of the serpent of worldly ignorance, and have cast off those prejudices of youth concerning the mysteries of the predominant religion of his native country. *All*

U 3

“ religious

Prince, they reject with indignation all interpretations which militate against either. Many of them are disgusted with the multiplicity of trials, and

*“ religious worship being only invented, in hopes of acquiring power, and to gain precedency among men; and by a flesh which covets, under the false pretence of piety, its neighbour’s riches; in fine, by Gluttony, the daughter of Hypocrisy, who, straining every nerve to restrain the carnal senses of those who possess riches, perpetually offer to them on the altar of their hearts, holocausts which voluptuousness, luxury, and perjury, have procured for them. This, my dear brother, is what you have to combat, such is the monster you have to crush under the emblem of the serpent. It is a faithful representation of that which the ignorant vulgar adore under the name of religion.*

*“ It was the prophane and timid Abiram who, transformed by a fanatic zeal into a tool of the Monks and religious rites, struck the first blows on the breast of our father Hiram; that is to say, who sapped the foundations of the celestial temple, which the ETERNAL had himself erected upon earth to sublime virtue.*

*“ The first age of the world witnessed what I assert. The most simple law of nature rendered our first fathers the happiest of mortals. The monster Pride appears on earth, he bellows, he is heard by men and by the happy mortals of those days. He promises them happiness in another life, and persuades them by his mellifluous words, that he taught men to adore the Eternal Creator of all things in a more extensive and more special manner than any person had done before on earth. This hydra with an hundred heads misled and misleads those men who are subject to its laws, and will continue its deceptions until the moment when the true*  
*“ Else*

and are content to remain in the inferior degrees, which suffice to give them the title of Masons, admit them to all the Masonic repasts, and even entitle them to the alms and benefactions which the Lodges bestow on their indigent brethren.— Those whose zeal is not cooled by this multiplicity of trials are generally admitted from the degree of *Master*, or from that of *Elef*, to the three Scotch degrees. We shall not seek for the history and tendency of these three degrees in books which have been written to discredit the craft. The German adept who translated them into his language for the instruction of his brethren, is one of the most zealous knights for the doctrine therein contained. His whole genius is exerted in their defence, nor could we follow a more unexceptionable author. His object was to infuse light into his brethren; and we prophane beings may draw the following conclusions from his lectures\*.

Every Mason who wishes to be admitted into the Scotch degrees, and even into all other degrees of Masonry, is first taught that until that period he has lived in slavery, and it is on that account only that he is admitted into the presence

“ *Elef* shall appear to combat and crush it entirely.” (See the degree of *Knights of the Sun*). Such doctrines need no comment.

\* See the Scotch degrees printed at Stockholm, 1784.

of the other brethren with a rope about his neck, praying that he may be delivered from his bonds. But when he aspires at the third Scotch degree, or at becoming a knight of St. Andrew, he must appear in a far more humiliating costume. The candidate is shut up in a dark cell, a rope with four slip knots is twisted round his neck, he is stretched out upon the floor; there, by the dull light of a twinkling lamp, he is abandoned to himself to meditate on the wretched state of slavery in which he exists, and to learn properly to estimate the value of Liberty. At length one of the brethren comes and introduces him to the Lodge, leading him by the rope, holding a drawn sword in his right hand as if meant to run him through the heart, in case he made any resistance. After having undergone a long examination, and particularly after having sworn on the salvation of his soul, never to reveal the secrets with which he is entrusted, he is declared free. It would be useless to enumerate all the different oaths; it is sufficient to say, that each degree and subdivision of degree, has its peculiar oath, and that they are all frightful; all call the vengeance of God and of the Brotherhood on the unhappy man who shall betray their secret. In future then we shall only treat of the doctrine of these secrets.

In the first degree of Scotch Knighthood the adept is informed, that he has been elevated to the  
dignity



dignity of *Higb Priest*. He receives a sort of benediction in the name of *the immortal and invisable Jehovah*, and in future it is under that title that he is to adore the Deity, *because* the signification of *JEHOVAH* is *far more expressive than that of ADONAI*.

In this first degree he receives the Masonic science only as descending from Solomon and Hiram, and revived by the Knights Templars.—But in the second degree he learns that it is to be traced to Adam himself, and has been handed down by Noah, Nimrod, Solomon, Hugo de Paganis, the founder of the Knights Templars, and Jaques de Molay, their last Grand Master, who each in their turns had been the favourites of *Jehovah*, and are styled the Masonic Sages. At length in the third degree it is revealed to him, that the celebrated *word* lost by the death of Hiram was this name of *Jehovah*. It was found, he is told, by the Knights Templars at the time when the Christians were building a Church at Jerusalem. In digging the foundations in that part on which the holy of holies of Solomon's temple formerly stood, they discovered three stones, which had formerly been parts of the foundation. The form and junction of these three stones drew the attention of the Templars; and their astonishment was extreme, when they beheld the name of *Jehovah* engraved on the last. This was the famous

mous word lost by the death of Adoniram. The Knights Templars, on their return to Europe, took great care not to lose so precious a monument. They carried them into Scotland, taking particular care of that which bore the name of Jehovah. The Scotch sages on their part were not forgetful of the respect due to such precious monuments, they made them the foundation stones of their first Lodge; and as these first stones were laid on St. Andrew's day, they took the name of Knights of St. Andrew. Their successors are entrusted with the secret, and are at this day the perfect masters of Freemasonry, the High Priests of Jehovah.

If we lay aside the hermetical part of the science, or the transmutation of metals, such will be in substance the whole doctrine which is revealed to the adept initiated in the grand mysteries of the Scotch degrees.

In a sort of Catechism, to which he answers to show that he has remembered every thing that he has seen, and all that has been explained to him in the Lodge, or, as it is then called, in Solomon's temple, the following question is asked, *Is that all you have seen?* To which he answers, *I have seen many other things, but, like the other Scotch Masters, I keep them secret in my heart.* This secret henceforth cannot be difficult to understand. It is only to view the *Scotch Master* in his new character of  
*High*

*Higb Priest of Jehovah*, or of that worship, that pretended Deism, which we have been told was successively the religion of Adam, Noah, Nimrod, Solomon, Hugo de Paganis, of the Grand Master Molay, and of the Knights Templars, and which at this day is to constitute the religion of the complete Master Mason.

These mysteries might have sufficed for the adepts. All who had obtained the Scotch degrees were declared free in future, and all were equally Priests of Jehovah. This priesthood ridded them of all the mysteries of the Gospel, and of all revealed religion. That liberty and happiness which the sect declares to consist in the revival of Deism, sufficiently instils into the mind of the adept what he is to think of Christianity and of its divine Author. Nevertheless the grand mysteries are not exhausted. The adepts still have to discover who was the person that wrested the *word*, the famous name of *Jehovah*, from their predecessors; that is to say, who it was that destroyed their favourite worship of Deism. It was but too evident that the whole fable of Hiram or Adoniram and of his assassins was no more than an allegory, the explanation of which must naturally answer the questions, who is the real assassin of Adoniram? By whom was the Deistical form of worship destroyed? Who was it that wrested the famous word from the sect? He is the person against whom the vengeance

geance and the hatred of the sect is directed, and it was necessary to instil the same spirit into the minds of its profound adepts. To effectuate this, we ascend to a new degree called the Knights *Rose Crucis*, or the Rosicrucians.

It is certainly a most atrocious blasphemy to accuse Christ of having destroyed by his religion the doctrine of the unity of God; when on the contrary the most evident and the most attested of all facts is, that to his religion we owe the banishment of thousands and thousands of false gods, which the Idolators had made to themselves. The gospel, in declaring the unity of God, teaches us the Trinity of Persons; but this mystery like all others which we learn from revelation, humbles the Sophisters in their own minds. Fraught with ingratitude against him who has cast the idols on the dust, they have sworn an eternal hatred against the eternal Word, because he reveals a God whom in their madness they are not able to comprehend. *Christ himself* in their eyes is the destroyer of the unity of God, he is the great enemy of *Jehovah*; and to infuse the hatred of the sect into the minds of the new adepts, constitutes the grand mystery of the new degree which they have called Rosicrucian.

Degree of  
Rose  
Crucis.

As the adept was seldom initiated into this new degree before he had passed through the Scotch degrees, he is already aware, as the reader must observe, that *Jehovah* is no longer the word fought

fought after, and here we shall see every thing relate only to the author of Christianity. The ornaments of the Lodge appear to be solely intended to recal to the candidate the solemn mystery of Mount Calvary. The whole is hung in black, an altar is to be seen at the bottom, and over the altar is a transparent representation of the three crosses, the middle one bearing the ordinary inscription.—The brethren in sacerdotal vestments are seated on the ground, in the most profound silence, sorrowful and afflicted, resting their heads on their arm to represent their grief. It is not the death of the son of God, who died victim of our sins, that is the cause of their affliction, the grand object of it is evident by the first answer which is made to the question with which all Lodges are generally opened.

The master asks the Senior Warden what o'clock it is? The answer varies according to the different degrees. In this it is as follows: “ It is the first  
 “ hour of the day, the time when the veil of the  
 “ temple was rent asunder, when darkness and  
 “ consternation was spread over the earth, when  
 “ the light was darkened, when *the implements of*  
 “ *Masonry were broken*, when the flaming star dis-  
 “ appeared, when the cubic stone was broken,  
 “ *when the word was lost* \*.”

\* See the degree Rosæ Crucis.

The

The adept who has attended to the progressive discoveries he has made in the different degrees, needs no further lessons to understand the meaning of this answer. He thereby learns that the day on which the *word* JEHOVAH was lost is precisely that on which the Son of God dying on a cross for the salvation of mankind consummated the grand mystery of our Religion, destroying the reign of every other, whether Judaic, natural, or sophistical.—The more a Mason is attached to the *word*, that is, to his pretended natural Religion, the more inveterate will his hatred be against the author of revealed religion.

Neither is this *word*, which he has already found, any longer the object of his researches ; his hatred has further views. He must seek for a new word, which shall perpetuate in his own mind and that of his brethren their blasphemous hatred for the God of Christianity ; and for this they adopt the inscription of the cross.

Every Christian knows the signification of INRI, *Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum* (Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews). The Rosicrucian is taught the following interpretation—the *Jew of Nazareth* led by *Raphael* into *Iudea* ; an interpretation which, divesting Christ of his divinity, assimilates him to a common man, whom the Jew Raphael conducts to Jerusalem there to suffer condign punishment for his crimes. As soon as the Candidate has  
proved

proved that he understands the Masonic meaning of this inscription INRI, the Master exclaims, *My dear Brethren the word is found again*, and all present applaud this luminous discovery, that HE whose death was the consummation and the grand mystery of the Christian Religion was no more than a common Jew crucified for his crimes.

It is thus that the sect have blasphemously adopted the very word, which recalls to the Christian all that love which he bears for the Son of God expiring on the cross for the salvation of mankind, as their watch-word of hatred. They repeat it to each other when they meet, and INRI is to perpetuate their spite against him who loved them even unto the death of the cross.

It is not on the authority of persons strangers to the craft that we have disclosed this atrocious mystery of Occult Masonry. What I have already said respecting my initiation to the first degrees put me in the way of conversing with those whom I knew to be more advanced, and in many of these interviews it happened, that, notwithstanding all their secrecy, some unguarded expressions escaped the most zealous adepts, which threw light on the subject. Others lent me their books, presuming that their obscurity and the want of the essential words, or the method of discovering them, would baffle all my attempts to understand them. I nevertheless discovered some of these words, such as *Jebo-  
vab,*

*vab*, by uniting several pages and only taking the bottom letter of each. This famous word discovered, I soon got knowledge of that of *Inri*. I then combined all I had seen, all that I knew of the different degrees, with what I had collected from divers conversations I had had with certain *Mafons*, whose *Philosophism* was otherwise known to me. I afterwards conversed with the most candid men whom I knew to be in the same degrees. I reprobated particularly those ceremonies so evidently in derision of Religion, and which they had never beheld but as games without any object. I never met with one who denied the facts as I have stated them. They owned the different reading of the word *Inri* in the degree *Rosæ Crucis*, but they denied the most distant idea of the consequences which I had drawn. Some, on reflection, acknowledged them to be well-founded, while others considered them as vastly exaggerated.

At the time when the Revolution took place; I combined my preceding discoveries, the decrees of the National Assembly, and the secret of the first degree, and no longer doubted that *Masonry* was but a society formed by men who, on the first initiation of their adepts, gave them the words Liberty and Equality as their secret, leaving to well-meaning and religious *Mafons* to interpret them according to their own principles; yet reserving to themselves to interpret (in their Occult degrees)



degrees) these same words according to the full extent of the French Revolution.

One of these Brethren, who had long since been admitted to the degree of Rosæ Crucis, but who was at the same time a very virtuous and religious man, was much concerned at seeing me in this opinion. He tried every means to give me a better idea of a society in which he was proud of having filled the most honorable posts. This was a topic on which we had often conversed; and he wished much to make me a convert to Masonry. He was indeed almost affronted with me for saying that he was not initiated into all the mysteries of Masonry, though a Rosicrucian, or else that this degree had its subdivisions, and that he was only partially acquainted with them. At length I convinced him of the fact, by asking the explanation of some of the Masonic *Hieroglyphics*; he owned that he had asked their meaning, but the explanation of them had been refused him; yet he had no doubt of their being as innocent emblems as the Square, the Compass, the Trowel, and many others. I knew that he had but one degree more to take, and the veil would be rent asunder. I proposed or rather marked out the means by which he might acquire that degree; and then, I told him, all illusion as to the real object of the Occult Masons would vanish. He was too eager for being initiated not to make a trial of the means I

VOL. II.

X

proposed;

proposed; but he was convinced that it would  
 prove ineffectual, and only furnish him with new  
 arms to combat my unjust prejudices against Ma-  
 sonry. A few days after I saw him enter my room ;  
 but in such a state of agitation, that his lips could  
 scarcely utter, " O my dear friend, my dear  
 " friend—you were in the right—Oh, how much  
 " you were in the right! . . . Where have I been?  
 " My God! where have I been?"—I easily un-  
 derstood these exclamations; but the poor man  
 could scarcely recover himself so as to continue.  
 He threw himself into a chair as if he were ex-  
 hausted, perpetually repeating, " Where have I  
 " been?—Oh how much you are in the right!"—  
 I earnestly desired him to give me some particu-  
 lars with which I was unacquainted—" Oh how  
 " much you were in the right!" he repeated  
 again; " but that is all I can tell you."—" Oh,  
 " unhappy man," I exclaimed, " you have then  
 " taken that execrable oath, and I am the person  
 " who has exposed you to that rash deed; I fin-  
 " cerely ask your pardon, but I protest upon my  
 " word, that I never reflected on that execrable  
 " oath when I suggested the means by which you  
 " might convince yourself, and learn to know  
 " those detested beings who have so horribly  
 " abused your credulity. I know that it had been  
 " better for you to have been for ever ignorant  
 " of that fatal secret, than that you should learn  
 " it at the expence of so horrid an oath. I really  
 " did

“ did not reflect on it, or I should never have exposed you to it ; no, I could not in conscience.” It was really true, that I never had reflected on this oath. Without examining whether such wicked oaths are binding, I feared being indiscreet. But it had been sufficient for me to have shown this gentleman that I was acquainted, at least in part, with these Occult mysteries. He saw clearly by my questions, that he had taught me nothing new by an avowal which alone proves the very essence of these Occult degrees.

His fortune had been ruined by the Revolution; and he declared to me, that it would from that moment be retrieved, provided he accepted of a proposal which had been made to him.—“ If I chuse,” said he, “ to go to London, Bruxelles, Constantinople, or any other town I please, neither I, my wife, nor my children, will ever want for any thing.”—“ Yes,” I replied, “ but on condition only that you go there *to preach Liberty and Equality ; in short, all the horrors of the Revolution.*”—“ *You are right,*” replied he, “ *but that is all I can say*—Oh, my God, where have I been !—I beg you will not question me any farther.”

This was sufficient for my present purpose ; but I hoped in time to learn farther particulars. Nor were my hopes vain. The following is what I have gathered from various Masons, who, finding

me acquainted with the major part of their secrets, spoke the more openly to me, till at length, feeling how much they had been duped by this Occult sect, they would willingly have revealed all its mysteries, could they have done it without exposing themselves to danger.

**Mystical  
Masonry.**

The explanation which was given to an adept of all that he had seen before on his admission to the degree of Rosæ Crucis, depended entirely on the disposition they observed in him. If they had to do with a man who was proof against their impiety, they sought to divert him from the Church under pretence of regenerating his faith; they represented to him, that there existed an infinity of abuses in Christianity at present, with respect to the Liberty and Equality of the children of God. With them, the word to be recovered was, a wish for a Revolution which should revive those times when every thing was common among Christians, when the distinctions of rich, of poor, or of high and mighty Lords, were unknown. They were taught to look forward to the most happy regeneration of mankind, and almost to a new heaven and a new earth. Credulous and simple minds were caught by such magnificent promises. They looked upon the Revolution as that sacred fire which was to purify the earth; and these credulous adepts were seen to second the Revolution with the enthusiastic zeal of a holy cause.

*This*

This may be called *Myftical Maſonry*. Such was the craft of all thoſe fools for whom the Occult Maſons ſet up the Propheteſs La Brouſſe, ſo famous in the beginning of the Revolution. Such again was that of the weak-minded Varlet, the Biſhop *in partibus* of Babylon. I never could conceive where he had gathered his religious opinions, when with the greateſt ſimplicity he complained that I had combated them. I was informed of it by a gueſt of his, whoſe reputation of great knowledge in Maſonry had acquired him a ſeat at the Maſonic repaſts which the poor ſimple man uſed to give; and even at thoſe dinners the difference was obſervable in the adepts, though of the ſame degree, each having received an explanation of the myſteries coinciding with his own diſpoſition. Our ſimple Biſhop viewed the whole ſcience of the Craft in no other light than as the perfection of the Goſpel; and even in his repaſts he was ever mindful of the precepts of the Church, keeping abſtinence on days appointed, &c. The Apoſtate Dom Gerles, on the contrary, was a Maſon of a quite different ſyſtem or explanation. He already ſung thoſe verſes which in a letter ſince found among Robeſpierre's papers \*, he declares to have addreſſed to truth alone :

\* Proceſ Verbal, No. 57.

X 3

N3

Ni Culte, ni Pretres, ni Roi,  
Car la Nouvelle Eve, c'est toi \*.

It was at these repasts that the Doctor La Mothe, a learned Rosicrucian, behaved with a modesty which seemed to prognosticate that one day he would equally hate both the craft of Varlet and of Dom Gerles. The latter paid his revolutionary debt to the guillotine; the other two are living, and I name them because I am not afraid of being contradicted, and because these sorts of anecdotes carry strong proof with them, and explain how persons of the most pious and charitable dispositions have been misled: how a Princess, the sister of the Duke of Orleans, was so blinded as even to pant after the Revolution, which in her eyes was to be nothing less than the regeneration of the Christian world †.

\* Nor Worship, nor Priests, nor King, for thou art the new Eve.

† The art shown in this degree should prove a salutary lesson to those who, without any examination, adopt political and religious ideas, and sport them in every company that will submit to hear them. Had they only reflected on the persons who had instilled them into their minds, or on the authors of the works whence they had adopted their ideas, how many honorable but misguided persons would, on such an examination, find they were no more than the blind apostles of every religious and political iniquity, and the agents of designing men! Abuses are certainly to be reformed, and our worship ought to be pure; but reflexion can never be detrimental to him who wishes to speak on either. T.

Such

Such explanations of the Rosicrucian degree were only for those dupes in whom they remarked a certain bias towards mysticity. The generality were abandoned to their own interpretations ; but when an adept testified a great desire of acquiring new lights, and was thought able to undergo the necessary trials, he was admitted to the degree of *Kadosch*, or of the *regenerated man*, where all ambiguity ceases.

It was to this degree that the adept of whom we have before spoken was admitted. Nor was the exhausted state in which he found himself after having undergone those trials to be wondered at. Adepts have told me, that no physical art is spared ; that there is no machinery, spectres, terrors, &c. &c. which are not employed, to try the constancy of the candidate. We are told by Mr. Monjoye, that the Duke of Orleans was obliged to ascend, and then throw himself off a ladder. If that were all, he was most kindly treated. A deep cave, or rather a precipice, whence a narrow tower rises to the summit of the lodge, having no avenue to it but by subterraneous passages replete with horror, is the place where the candidate is abandoned to himself, tied hand and foot. In this situation he finds himself raised from the ground by machines making the most frightful noise. He slowly ascends this dark vault, sometimes for hours together, and then suddenly falls

Degree of  
Kadosch.

as if he were not supported by any thing. Thus mounting and falling alternately, he must carefully avoid showing any sign of fear. All this however is a very imperfect account of the terrors of which men, who had undergone these trials, speak. They declared that it was impossible for them to give an exact description of them; they lost their senses; they did not know where they were. Draughts were given to them, which, adding to their corporal strength, did not restore them to their mental faculties; but rather increased their strength only to leave them a prey to fury and terror.

Many circumstances relating to this degree made us believe at first sight that it was connected with *Illuminism*; but on examination we find it to be only a farther explanation of the Masonic allegory. Here again the candidate is transformed into an assassin. Here it is no longer the founder of Masonry, Hiram, who is to be avenged, but it is Molay the Grand Master of the Knights Templars, and the person who is to fall by the assassin's hand is *Philippe le Bel*, King of France, under whose reign the order of the Templars was destroyed.

When the adept falls forth from the cavern with the reeking head, he cries *Nekom* (I have killed him). After this atrocious trial he is admitted to take the oath. I learned from one of the adepts, that at the time when he was about to take the oath, one of the *Knights Kadosch* held a pistol  
at



at his breast, making a sign that he would murder him if he did not pronounce it. On my asking if he believed that it was in earnest, he said that he certainly did believe so, though he could not be sure. At length the veil is rent asunder. The adept is informed, that till now he had only been partially admitted to the truth ; that Liberty and Equality, which had constituted the first secret on his admission into Masonry, consisted in recognizing no superior on earth, and in viewing Kings and Pontiffs in no other light than as men on a level with their fellow men, having no other rights to sit on the throne, or to serve at the altar, but what the people had granted them, and of which they had the power of depriving them whenever they pleased. They are also informed, that Princes and Priests have too long abused the goodness and simplicity of the people ; that the grand object of Masonry, - in building temples to Liberty and Equality, is, to rid the earth of this double pest, by destroying every altar which credulity and superstition had erected, and every throne on which were only to be seen despots tyrannizing over slaves.

These documents concerning the degree of Kadosch are not merely taken from the works of Messrs. Monjoye and Le Franc, but from adepts themselves. Besides, it is easy to perceive how exactly this account corresponds with the avowal  
of

of the adept who was obliged to own that I was quite in the right when I told him that this was the final object of Free-masonry.

Oh how profound the combination of these mysteries! their progress is slow and tortuous; but how artfully each degree tends to the grand object.

The different degrees compared.

In the two first degrees, that is to say, in those of *Apprentice* and *Fellow-craft*, the sect begins by throwing out its *Liberty and Equality*. After that, it occupies the attention of its novices with puerile games of fraternity or Masonic repasts; but it already trains its adepts to the profoundest secrecy by the most frightful oaths.

In that of *Master*, it relates the allegorical history of Adoniram, who is to be avenged; and of the *word*, which is to be recovered.

In the degree of *Elef*, it trains the adepts to vengeance, without pointing out the person on whom it is to fall. It carries them back to the time of the Patriarchs, when, according to them, men knew no religion but that of nature, and when every body was equally Priest and Pontiff. But it had not as yet declared that all religion revealed since the time of the Patriarchs was to be thrown aside.

This last mystery is only developed in the Scotch degrees. There the brethren are declared free: The word so long sought for is, Deism; it is the worship

worship of Jehovah, such as was known to the Philosophers of nature. The true Mason becomes the Pontiff of Jehovah; and such is the grand mystery by which he is extricated from that darkness in which the profane are involved.

In the degree *Rosæ Crucis* he who wrested the word, who destroyed the worship of *Jehovah*, is Christ himself, the Author of Christianity; and it is on the Gospel and on the Son of Man that the adept is to avenge the brethren, the Pontiffs of *Jehovah*.

At length, on his reception as *Kadosch*, he learns that the assassin of Adoniram is the King, who is to be killed to avenge the Grand Master Molay, and the order of the Masons successors of the Knights Templars. The religion which is to be destroyed to recover the word, or the true doctrine, is the religion of Christ, founded on revelation. This word in its full extent is *Liberty and Equality*, to be established by the total overthrow of the altar and the throne.

Such are the incipient degrees, the process, and the whole system of Masonry; it is thus that the sect by its gradual explanation of its twofold principle of *Liberty and Equality*, of its allegory of the founder of Masonry to be avenged, of the word to be recovered, leading the adepts from secret to secret, at length initiates them into the whole Jacobinical code of Revolution.

We

We are not to lose sight of the extreme care with which the adept is questioned on all that he has seen before, whenever he is initiated to a new degree, lest he should overlook the intimate connection subsisting between each; and thus in the first degrees *Liberty and Equality* are given to him as the secret, while the complete explanation and application of them form the mysteries of the last\*.

The more frightful these hidden mysteries of the Lodges shall appear to the historian, the more strenuously it becomes his duty to insist on the numbers of honest Masons who never partook of these horrid mysteries. Nothing is more easy than to be duped in Masonry. Such may have been the lot of those who only seek to make acquaintances in the Lodges, or to pass their leisure hours with men apparently intimate at first sight. It is true, that this intimacy seldom extends beyond the walls of the Lodge; but the days of their meeting are often days of festivity. These repasts are certainly heightened by the temporary Equality, which adds much to the mirth of the meeting; and all cares subside for the day. What has been said of

\* I am not ignorant of the existence of several other degrees in Occult Masonry, such as those of the *Star* and of the *Druids*. The Prussians have added theirs, and the French have done as much. We thought it sufficient to attach ourselves to the most common ones, as most proper to delineate the conduct and spirit of the sect.

certain

certain assemblies where decency was not respected, is most certainly the invention of calumny. The extreme order and morality of these meetings has often proved a snare to captivate those who are to be caught with outward appearances, and Cagliostro's infamous behaviour would have made many desert the Lodges. This monstrous Adonis disgusted all Strasbourg, and was betrayed by the cries of the Egyptian sisters. It was no longer the age when the mysteries of the Adamites could be approved of. He was driven from that town for having attempted to introduce them. He would in like manner have ruined the craft had he continued to confound his Lodges with those of the East. Such was not the behaviour of our modern Masonry; on the contrary it appeared, that it had neither Religion nor Government in view; and they were seldom mentioned in the generality of Lodges. It was only on the day of initiation, that the reflecting adept could surmise that it had any future object; but even on those very days the trials were rather a subject of diversion than of reflection; and, so far from meditating on the allegorical emblems, they were rather diverted from it by the sect, until favourable dispositions had been discovered in them for their farther initiation.—The sect well knew, that a day would come when a small number of the Occult Masons would suffice to put all the inferior multitude of adepts in motion.

tion. It is thus that it may be easily explained how there have existed so many honest Masons, and how so many are still to be found who have never surmised any thing in their games but the mysteries of an innocent Liberty and Equality, no ways alluding either to Religion or the state.

In defence of English Masonry, we may add, that they allow only of the three first degrees.—Prudence and wisdom have made them reject the wish of avenging the death of Adoniram on his pretended assassin, a wish that we have seen converted in the Occult Lodges into a desire of revenging the Masons and their founder Molay, and then into a wish of avenging the Masonic Liberty and Equality by the extinction of all Kings. Nothing of this is to be found in the English Masonry. Nor is that mysterious pursuit of the *word* which was lost by Adoniram to be traced. You are immediately informed that it is *Jehovah*. He who could wish to draw certain inferences from this, would have a long course of reasonings to run through, none of which appear to have ever been thought of by the English Masons. With them *Jehovah* is no more than the universal god of human nature; it is to be sure rather extraordinary that they should pretend to be the only people who have any knowledge of that God; but their conclusion is, that all mankind, and particularly the Free-masons, ought to live with and succour each other like brethren.

Nothing

Nothing appears in their mysteries tending towards the hatred of Christianity, or that of Kings.

Their laws and institutes with respect to Religion are comprehended in declaring, " That a  
 " Mason will never be a stupid Atheist nor an ir-  
 " religious Libertine. That though in former  
 " times every Mason was obliged to profess the  
 " religion of the state or nation he lived in, at  
 " present, leaving every one to enjoy his own  
 " private opinions, they are only bound to follow  
 " the religion in which every body agrees, a reli-  
 " gion which consists in being good, sincere,  
 " modest, and men of honour." Certainly such laws do not oblige the English Mason to be a Deist, but only to be an honest man, whatever may be his religion.

With regard to the civil powers, a part of their laws are expressed as follows: " A Mason shall be  
 " a peaceable subject, and cheerfully conform to  
 " the laws of the country in which he resides.  
 " He shall not be concerned in plots or con-  
 " spiracies against Government; and he shall pay  
 " proper respect to the civil Magistrate. Should  
 " a brother be implicated in rebellion against the  
 " state, he shall not be supported in his rebellion."  
 Such are the laws to be found in Thomas Wolfson and William Preston, the one full of contempt the other full of zeal for English Masonry; both nevertheless agree as to the laws of the Lodges.

We

We are not therefore to confound English Masonry with the Occult Lodges, which they have prudently rejected.

We perfectly well know that many English are initiated in the Occult mysteries of the Rosicrucians and Scotch degrees ; but it is *not their Occult Science* which constitutes them English Masons, for the first three degrees are all that are acknowledged in England.

Having made these exceptions, we shall continue our proofs ; for it is not on their degrees alone that we have founded our judgment of the Occult Masons. Were we strangers to their rites and ceremonies, the reader will judge what opinions we should form on perusing the doctrines of their most celebrated writers.

---

CHAP.



## CHAP. XI.

*New Proofs of the System and Mysteries of the Occult Masons.*

IN order to form a proper idea of the extent of the system of the Occult Lodges of Free-masonry, let us combine in this Chapter two essential points; first, the general doctrine of the most zealous and learned Masons; secondly, their divers opinions as to their origin.

Masonic writers in general divide Free-masonry into three classes, the Hermetic, the Cabalistic (which comprehends the Martinists), and the Eclectic Masonry. Let us first take a view of the religious tenets of these different classes, and we shall find that, like our modern Sophisters, they only agree in one point, and that is in their hatred to Christianity and Revelation; in all other points we shall find them in perfect opposition to one another with respect to their religious tenets or rather blasphemous impieties.

The Hermetic Masonry, or the Scotch degrees, who work in chymistry, have adopted *Pantbeism* or the true *Spinosism*. With them *every thing is God, and God is every thing*. That is their grand

VOL. II.

Y

mystery,

Division  
of the  
Systems  
and Ma-  
sonic  
sects.

Hermetic  
Masonry.

mystery, engraved in one word *Jehovab* on the stone brought by the Knights Templars from the Holy Land.

Let the reader refer to the preface of the zealous Knight of St. Andrew, who has given us such a circumstantial account of these degrees. *He will* there see our Knight reducing the result of his whole doctrine to this famous text of Hermes Trismegistus, "All is part of God; if all is part, the whole must be God. Therefore every thing that is made made itself, and will never cease to act, for this agent cannot repose. And as God has no end, so can his works have neither beginning nor end." After having recited this passage our Pantheistical adept tells us, "Such is the summary though expressive belief of the whole Hermetic System;" in a word the whole religious system of the Scotch degrees, with the discovery of which he is so much pleased.

Let not the reader suppose that he attempts to explain away the expression *all is God*. In his opinion nothing but the grossest ignorance and prejudice can disapprove of the assertion: It is in vain to object, that, making the grain of sand, the Heavens, the Earth, the animal, or man, *a part of God*, is rendering the Deity divisible; for he will answer, that it is only the grossest ignorance which hides from us, that *those millions of millions of parts are so united together and so essentially constitute*

*pute a God whole, that to separate a single particle would be to annihilate the whole itself, or the Great JEHOVAH. But, lest the Knight of the Craft should be vain on finding himself a part of God, our Hierophant informs us, that as the little finger is always less than the whole body ; so is man, though a small particle of God, infinitely smaller than JEHOVAH. Our adept may nevertheless rejoice, how ever small a particle he may be of the Deity, as the day will come when he is to be reunited to the great whole, the day when, every thing being reunited to the great Jehovah, harmony will be complete, and true Pantheism will be established for ever \*.*

It is to be hoped that the reader does not expect us to trouble ourselves with the refutation of so monstrous a system. The preface however is not the only part of that work which lays down this system as the tenets of these degrees ; for, after the description of them, we find what are called *Solomon's Thesis* ; also the *Archetype world* ; and these are productions all tending to strengthen them in their impiety †. We shall not therefore be accused of calumniating this branch of Masonry by attributing to it a system which makes the villain, like the just man, a constituent part of the Deity,

\* Preface to the Scotch Degrees.

† Second Part, Edition of Stockholm, 1782.

and represents vice and virtue as the very action of the Deity; a system which promises the same destiny to the good and to the wicked, of being *re-united to the Deity*; and thus, after having ceased to be man, of being God to all eternity.

**Cabalistic  
Masonry.** The Cabalistic system, without being *less impious*, is far more humiliating for the human understanding; and that especially in an age which pretends to the high-sounding appellation of the Philosophic age, of the age of light. It was in the Prussian Lodges of the Rosicrucians that this Cabalistic system was to be found; at least before their union with the Illuminés\*. We have authentic information, that this was adopted by certain Lodges of Rosicrucians in France a few years before the Revolution, and particularly at Bourdeaux. To prevent, however, all possibility of being mistaken, whatever we shall say on this subject shall be grounded on the Cabalistic lectures lately printed under the title of *Télescope de Zoroastre*. They are dedicated to one of those Princes whom the author does not name, but whose zealous pursuits in these mysteries are sufficiently known by public report. With such a guide we shall not be accused of imposing on our readers.

\* Letters from Philon to Spartacus;

\* The JEHOVAH of this sect is no longer the *God* WHOLE; but he is at once the *God* SISAMORO, and the *God* SENAMIRA. The first is joined by the *Genius* SALLAK, and the second by the *Genius* SOKAK. If these famous Cabalistic words are inverted, we have *Oromasis* or the *God* GOOD, and *Arimanes* the *God* EVIL, and the Genii will become *Kallas* and *Kakos*, pretty correctly Greek for GOOD and BAD\*.

Thus in attributing to OROMASIS a multitude of good Genii or spirits like himself, and to ARIMANES evil Genii participating of his own wickedness, we have the JEHOVAH of *Cabalistic Masonry*; that is to say, the word to be recovered in their Lodges, or the tenets to be substituted to those of Christianity.

Of these good and evil Genii, some are more perfect spirits and preside over the planets, the rising and setting of the Sun, the increase and decrease of the Moon; others, inferior to the first, but superior to the human soul, exercise their empire over the Stars and Constellations; but in both these classes, the good are the angels of life, victory and happiness, while the bad are the angels of death and calamity. All know the secrets of the past, present, and to come, and can impart this great science to the adepts. To captivate

\* Telescope de Zoroastre, page 13.

their favour, the Cabalistic Mason is to study what we should call the Conjuring-book. He must be well versed in the names and signs of the planets and constellations; he must also know whether it be a good or evil Genius which presides over it, and which are the numbers that represent them. By the word *Gbenclia*, for example, he must understand the rising Sun, a pure, mild and active spirit, presiding at births, and at all natural affections which are good. *Sethophoros*, on the contrary, is Saturn, the planet which may be looked upon as the head quarters of the evil Genii.

It is not our object to give a dictionary of all their Hieroglyphics, much less to describe the circles, the triangles, the table, the urns, and the magic mirrors, in a word all the science of the Cabalistic Rosicrucian. The reader has seen a sufficient specimen, to be convinced, that the whole is an incoherent system of the vilest and grossest superstition. It might be only humiliating to nature, did not the adept carry his impiety to such an extent, that he looks upon the communication with, and apparitions of the Devils, whom he invokes under the appellation of Genii, as a special favour, and on them he relies for the whole success of his enchantments. If we are to credit the masters of the art, the Cabalistic Mason will be favoured by these good and evil Genii, in proportion to the confidence he has in their power; they

they will appear to him, and they will explain more to him in the magic table, than the human understanding can conceive.

Nor is the adept to fear the company of the *evil Genii*. He must firmly believe, that *the worst among them*, the most hideous of those beings which the vulgar call *Devils*, are never bad company for mortals. In many cases he is to prefer the company of these evil Genii to that of the good; the latter frequently costing you your rest, fortune, and sometimes even your life; while we often have the greatest obligations to the former\*.

From whencesoever these Genii or Devils may come, it is from them alone that the adept can learn the occult sciences, which will infuse into him the spirit of prophecy. He will be informed, that Moses, the Prophets, and the three Kings, had no other teachers, no other art, but that of Cabalistic Masonry, like him and Nostradamus.

When immersed in this delirium of folly and impiety the adept becomes dear to the sect. He will have shown that he prefers the doctrine of *Sisamoro* and of *Senamira* to that of the gospel; that he had rather be a madman than a Christian; and then he will have attained the grand object of the last mysteries of Cabalistic Masonry.

\* Id. page 118 and 136.

Those Masons who may have adopted a different course to arrive at the same end, are to take great care not to discredit the Cabal. Though they disbelieve the art themselves, let them say at least, " That there is nothing wonderful in judicial " astrology but its means; that its tendency is ex- " tremely simple: That it is very possible, that " at the hour of your birth a star should be in a " certain position of the Heavens, and in a parti- " cular aspect, and that nature should follow a " particular course, which, through a concatena- " tion of causes, would be favourable or fatal to " you." Then let them add a few Sophisms to corroborate this idea, and give themselves out for learned Philosophers, and the sect will approve their conduct as tending to avenge the Cabalistic Mason, and bring his science into repute\*.

\* See the *Continuation OF ERRORS AND OF TRUTH* by an unknown *Philosopher*. Masonic Era 5784. Chap. OF VICES AND ADVANTAGES. Notwithstanding the title of this book, it is far from being a *Continuation* of the work of which I am about to treat. It was only a snare laid by Holbach's club, who, seeing the immense run which Mr. de St. Martin's work had, adopted the title of *Continuation OF ERRORS AND OF TRUTH* to attract the curiosity of the public. In this pretended continuation, whole pages are copied from the works of the club, coinciding in nothing with Mr. de St. Martin's system, excepting in its zeal for Masonry.

Were



Were I not writing for the Historian, I should fear to abuse my reader's patience with the enumeration of these absurdities of Occult Masonry. But in describing the grand causes of a Revolution *which threatens all Europe*, it is necessary at least to give a general idea of those systems of Impiety and Rebellion whence it originated. We spare him the trouble of research, he will only have to verify our quotations; he will know from what sources he is to derive his proofs. Beside, one of the most dangerous arts of the sect, is not only to hide its tenets and its variegated means of attaining its Revolutionary object, but it wishes even to conceal the very names of its different classes. That which may appear to be the farthest from Impiety or Rebellion may be the most strenuous in its attempts to revive the antique systems of the bitterest enemies to Governments and to Christianity.

It may be matter of surprize to many, to see me comprehend the Martinists among the latter, they are, nevertheless, the persons whom I had in view. As to the origin of Mr. de St. Martin, who has given them his name, we are ignorant; but we defy any body to show a greater appearance of probity, or to assume a more devout and mellifluous mystical strain, than the hypocrisy of this spurious offspring

offspring of Curbicus the slave \*. We have been acquainted with men whom he had seduced, with others that he wished to seduce, and all spoke of his great zeal and respect for Christ and his gospel, and for Governments. We shall seek his doctrines and his views in his own writings, in the *Apocalypse* of his adepts, in his famous book of ERRORS

\* *Terebinthus*, or *Budda*, a disciple of *Scythian*, a conjurer, finding that the Persian Priests opposed his designs, retired to a *widow's house* in Palestine to whom he left all his money and books. She bought a slave named *CURBICUS*, whom she afterwards adopted and caused to be instructed in all the sciences of Persia. After her death he quitted the name of *Curbicus*, to blot out the memory of his first condition, and took that of *MANES*, which in the Persian language signifies *discourse*. For an account of his doctrines many learned writers, and particularly St. Augustin, may be consulted. They are represented as the common sewer of all the impieties of the times, and as the seat of empire which Satan had chosen to himself.

*Manes* had the insolence to promise the King of Persia that he would cure his son by his prayers, and the credulous Prince, believing him, neglected the remedies of art, and sent away his physicians. The son died, and *Manes* was thrown into prison; but, escaping from thence, he fled into Mesopotamia; after various adventures however, falling into the hands of the King of Persia, he was flayed alive, and his carcass cast upon the dunghill to be devoured by wild beasts. His skin was stuffed, and hung up on one of the city gates.—His followers honoured him as a martyr, and, in memory of his being flayed with reeds, *they slept upon them*.—(See the "Annals of the Church,"—Third Age). T.

AND

AND OF TRUTH. We have learned to our cost what labour and what pains are necessary to unravel this work of darkness; but surely the same perseverance should be shown by the disciples of truth, as by the adepts of darkness.

Much patience is requisite to understand and to elucidate the code of the Martinist Mason, amidst its mysterious language of numbers and enigmas. We will spare as much as possible this trouble to our readers. Let the Hero of these doctrines appear, and he will be found to be no other than the servile copyist of the absurdities of the Heresiarch Slave, and a rival of his hypocrisy. With all the tortuosities of MANES we shall behold him leading his adepts through the same paths, infusing into them the same hatred for the altars of Christianity, for the thrones of Sovereigns, and for all political establishments whatever. We will begin with his religious systems; but though we shall compress whole volumes of impious absurdity into a few pages, still we must again appeal to the patience of the reader; for as their Martinist Masons contributed much to the Revolution, it is necessary that their sophistical reveries should be known.

We are, then, to form an idea of a *first being*; *one*; *universal*; *of himself*; *and the beginning of all principle*. At first sight, this *first being* appears to be the God WHOLE, or the *Jehovah* of Pantheism:  
and

and such really is the *first being* of the Martinists \*. But this God whole comprehends a twofold God ; one the principle of good, the other of evil. The former, though produced by the *first being*, holds of itself the whole of its power, and all its worth. It is infinitely good, and can only do good. It produces another being of its own substance, at first good like itself, but which soon becomes infinitely bad, and can do nothing but evil †. The God Good, though it holds all its power of itself, could neither create this world, nor any corporeal being, without the means of the God EVIL ‡ : the one acts, the other reacts, and from their conflicts the world is framed, and bodies are formed of the sparks, as it were, emanating from this struggle between the God or principle of GOOD, and the God or principle of EVIL.

“ Man already existed at that time, as no origin  
 “ can be anterior to man. He is antecedent to  
 “ any being in nature ; he existed before the birth  
 “ of the Genii ; nevertheless he only came after  
 “ them §. Man at that time existed without a  
 “ body, and a much preferable state to that in  
 “ which he is at present ; for, inasmuch as his  
 “ actual state is limited, and replete with disgust,

\* Of Errors and of Truth, 2d Part, page 149.

† First Section.

‡ Ibid. Of Temporal Causes and Concatenations.

§ Ibid. Of Primitive Man.

“ so

“ so was his former unlimited and abounding in  
“ delights \*.

By the ill use he made of his Liberty, he erred from the centre at which the *God Good* had placed him ; he then acquired a body, and that was the period of his first fall. But in his fall he preserved his dignity ; he is still of the same *essence* as the *God Good*. To convince ourselves of it, “ we have  
“ only to reflect on the nature of thought ; and  
“ we shall soon perceive, that it being simple, one,  
“ and unalterable, there can be but one sort of  
“ being capable of it ; as nothing can be common  
“ between beings of different natures. We shall  
“ observe, that if man has in himself an idea of a  
“ Supreme Being, of an active and intelligent  
“ cause which executes his will, he must be of the  
“ same essence as that superior Being †.” Therefore, according to the Martinist System, *the God Good*, *the God Evil*, and every *thinking being*, or, in other words, God, Man, and the Devil, are of the same nature, the same essence, and the same species.

\* Ibid.—We think it necessary to inform our readers, that we have made use of the Edinburgh edition, which is the least enigmatical. As Philosophism and Impiety gained ground, the Martinists thought they might have fewer *voluntary* obscurities, and they have suppressed, or given in common print, what was originally only expressed in cyphers, in which the first edition abounds.

† Ibid. Of the Affinities of Thinking Beings, page 205.

If

If therefore the adept does not think himself God or Devil, it is not the fault of his teachers. There is, however, a remarkable difference between man and the *God Evil*. For the Devil, or the principle of Evil, separated from the *God Good*, can never return to him; whereas man will return to the same state he was in antecedently to time and the *sparkling* conflict. "He erred  
" by going from four to nine, but re-establishes  
" himself by returning from nine to four \*."

This enigmatical jargon becomes more intelligible as the adept advances in the mysteries. He learns that the number *four* signifies a *strait line*—number *nine* the *circumference* or the *curve line*†: then that the sun is a *quaternary* number; that number *nine* represents *the moon*, and consequently

\* This was precisely the lesson Mr. de St. Martin was explaining to the Marquis de C——. He traced his circles on the table; then, pointing to the centre, he added, "You see  
" how every thing emanating from the centre moves in the  
" radius to reach the circumference."—"I perceive it," says the Marquis; "but I also observe, that having reached  
" the circumference this body emanating from the centre  
" may proceed in a tangent or a strait line; and then I do  
" not understand how you can demonstrate that it must necessarily be returned back to the centre." This was sufficient to disconcert the learned Doctor of the Martinists. He nevertheless continued to teach, that souls emanating from God by the number four, would return to him by the number nine.

† Ibid. 2d Part, page 106, 126.

*the*

*the earth of which it is but a satellite*\*: and hence the adept concludes, that man anterior to time was in the sun or in the centre of light. That he flew from thence by the radius, and that, passing by the moon, he remains on the earth, until the time comes when he shall be reflected back to his centre, to be incorporated with the *God Good*.

In the mean time, till he can enjoy that happiness, "it is a most fallacious system to pretend to lead men to wisdom *by the frightful description of eternal flames in a life to come*. Such descriptions are of no avail when unfelt; therefore the blind teachers, who can only represent those torments to us in imagination, must necessarily produce but little effect upon us †."

The enlightened Martinist, soaring above such teachers, erases the pains of hell from his moral code; and it is worthy of remark, that this is the leading feature in the Systems of the Sophisters of the Occult Lodges, as well as of the Sophisters of the Secret Academy. We should be tempted to suppose, that they knew no means of working their salvation but by destroying the possibility of being damned; and that, by denying the existence of hell, they sought to harden themselves and all nations to crimes the most deserving of the divine vengeance.

\* Ibid. Page 114 and 215.

† Ibid. First Section.

The

The Martinist substitutes "*three temporal worlds*." "There are but three degrees of Expiation, or "three degrees of real F. M. (*Free-masonry*)."  
This is pretty clearly asserting, that the perfect Mason neither has sin to fear, nor penance to perform; but in every sense the reader can no longer doubt of the systematic impiety which reigns throughout these absurdities, in direct opposition to the Gospel. It was not sufficient for the sect to renew in their hatred the ancient blasphemies of a senseless Philosophy; but the detestation of Laws, Sovereigns, and Governments, was to mingle with their mysteries; and in this our Martinist adept only primes over the Jacobin, by the art and cunning with which he infuses his spirit of Rebellion, and broods over the downfall of the Throne.

Let not the zealous adept appear, protesting his respect for the Throne or Government; I have heard their protestations, I have heard those of their masters; but I have also heard their doctrines, and seen their transactions. It is in vain for their chief to teach them privately, or to envelop them in enigmatic language; for, had I not hereafter to unfold the iniquitous mysteries of the Illuminées, the reader would be ready to pronounce, without hesitation, that of all the conspiring sects the Martinist Lodges are the most dangerous.

Necker,



Necker, La Fayette, or Mirabeau, notwithstanding their Sovereignty of the People, sought a Constitutional King; Brissot, Syeyes, or Petion, supported the Republican System; conventions, compacts, and oaths, were admitted by both. But the Martinist denies the legitimacy of every Empire which may have originated in violence, force, or conquest; he denies all society whose foundation rests on conventions or compacts, though freely entered into. The former are acts of tyranny, which never can be legitimated; no anti-quity, no *prescription* can render them valid, *prescription* being a mere invention of tyranny, as a palliative to injustice, in direct opposition to the laws of nature, which knows of no such invention. “The edifice formed on a voluntary association is equally as imaginary as if it were on a forced association\*.” To prove these two assertions, and particularly the latter, is the main object of our Hero’s Sophistry. He easily decides, that it is *impossible that any social compact could have been freely entered into by all the individuals of a state*. He asks, *whether it stands to reason that man should rely on those who had formed such a compact, or whether they ever had the power of forming it?* He examines the question, and concludes, “that a voluntary association is neither more just nor reasonable

\* Ibid. Section 5.

" than it is practicable, since by such an act, man  
 " must invest other men with a right (his own li-  
 " berty) which he cannot dispose of himself; and  
 " since he transfers a right which he has not, he  
 " makes a convention which is absolutely void, and  
 " which neither himself, the chiefs, nor subjects can  
 " put into execution, since it can neither have been  
 " binding on the one nor the other \*."

Then come the innocent artifices of protesta-  
 tions of fidelity and submission to the reigning  
 powers, and invitations not to trouble the order of  
 the existing laws and governments; but stupidity  
 itself cannot be duped by such artifices. After the  
 Martinist has told us, that social compacts, though  
 freely formed, are null, and that associations formed  
 by force are void, what can be the submission  
 which the Civil Laws, the Magistrates, or the  
 Princes can exact from their subjects?

The Hero of the Martinists also shudders at the  
 very idea of revolt, or of insurrection; but then  
 it is because the individual is exposed to acts of  
 violence resulting from *private authority*. When  
 the mob shall have imbibed these principles, when  
*private* violences are no longer to be feared, what  
 will all these restrictions and exhortations avail for  
 the preservation of peace and submission to the  
 constituted authorities? Does not the Martinist

\* Ib. Part H. Sect. 5, page 9.

try every means to persuade that same mob that there never existed a legitimate Prince, nor a lawful Government? Is he not perpetually recalling them to their *first origin*, "when the rights of one man over another were not known, because it was impossible that such rights could exist among equal beings \*?"

Wish them, it is sufficient to observe the variations of Governments, and their succession; that some have perished, others are perishing, or will perish before the end of the world, to be convinced that they are no more than the offspring of the caprice of man, or of their disordered imaginations †.

In fine, I know that the Martinist makes profession of a true government, a real authority of man over men, and that he pleases to call it a Monarchy. But notwithstanding all the subtilities of his mysterious language, this very profession will prove to be the most universal Conspiracy against every existing Government. He tells us, that there is a superiority to be acquired by one man over others, the superiority of learning, of means, of experience, which bring him nearer to his *original state*, and this is a superiority of *fact*, "and of necessity, because other men, having applied less and not having reaped the same advantages, will stand in need of him, from the

\* Ibid. Part II. page 16 and 17.

† Ibid. *Of the Instability of Governments*, page 34 and 35.

“poverty and dimness of their faculties \*.”—The reader will naturally conclude, that according to this system nobody could exercise a lawful authority over his equals, but in right of his virtues, his experience, and his means of being useful. And that is in reality the first artifice of the sect, which immediately overthrows all idea of hereditary succession, which submits the rights of the Sovereign to the reveries of the factious and of the populace on the virtue, talents, and success of him who governs. But let us follow their windings, and unfold their mysterious writings. “If every man, say they, attained to the same degree of his own power, then every man would be a King.”

These words evidently show, that in the sense of the Martinist, he only is not King who is not arrived at the last degree of *his power*, or of his strength in the *natural* state. A little further it appears, that this difference alone can constitute a real political authority, that such is the *principle of unity*, *the only one* by which nature allows the exercise of a legitimate authority over men, *the only light which can reunite them in a body* †.

The reader may believe it to be a chimerical research to seek in the history of man for a society where he alone commands whose *powers* or facul-

\* Ibid. page 18.

† Ibid. page 29.

ties have been the best developed in the order of nature, where he alone obeys who has not acquired this *degree of power*; but the Martinist will carry him back "to those happy days said to have had "no existence but in the imagination of the poets, "because, distant from them, and strangers to "their sweets, we have been weak enough to believe, that because we did not enjoy them, they "could not exist \*."

Should you not immediately perceive that the only legitimate authority is that exercised of old, or in the golden age, when each father of a family was the sole king; when the son, acquiring sufficient strength and age to develop his *powers*, became king himself; should you deny these consequences, and object, that no government had ever perpetuated itself since the commencement of the world, and that consequently the rule given to discover the only legitimate government pointed out none; you are then left to your own imagination, and the adept will continue, "Nevertheless, it is one of "those truths which I can best affirm, nor do I "pledge myself too far, when I certify to my "equals, that there are governments which have "*subsisted ever since man was first placed upon earth,* "and will *subsist until the end*; and that for the "same reasons which made me assert, that here

• Ibid,

Z 3

" below

"below there always had been and always will  
 "be legitimate governments \*." What then are  
 or can be these legitimate governments which the  
 Martinist recognizes? What can be these govern-  
 ments which have subsisted from the beginning,  
 and will subsist until the end of time? None can  
 be surmised, but that of the patriarchs, or of the  
 first families governed by the sole paternal autho-  
 rity. In later ages, can any other be found than  
 that of isolated families, or of the Nomades, the  
 Tartars, or the Savages roaming through forests  
 without any other chief than the father of the fa-  
 mily? And it is there alone, that those whose age  
 has equally developed their strength and *their*  
*power*, will find themselves all *equal* and each a  
*king*, that is to say, each one recognizing no other  
 law than his own, and each acquiring at the same  
 age all the power of a father over his children.  
 This government may perhaps be traced in civil  
 society; each private family abstractedly taken  
 may be said to perpetuate this government, and it  
 has existed and will perpetuate itself until the end  
 of time. Now let the reader reflect on what has  
 been said on governments formed by force or free  
 compact, on those governments which have pe-  
 rished, do perish, or will perish before the end of  
 time, and which by this distinctive mark are known

\* Ibid. Page 35 and 36.

to be illegitimate. He will clearly perceive, that all the zeal of the Martinists for the *true monarchy*, for the *only legitimate* government, the *only one consistent with nature*, the only one lasting as the world, is nothing else but the wish of reducing all society, all legitimate authority, to that of a father governing his children; to overturn every throne and annihilate every law but that of the ancient patriarchs.

Such is the whole tendency of the political system of the Martinists. Many more blasphemies both religious and political might be extracted from this work; nor would it be impossible to prove, that in the sense of the Martinists, the *great adultery* of man, the true cause of all his misfortunes in this world, the real original sin of mankind, was his having divorced himself from the laws of nature, to subject himself to laws which nature condemns, to those of Emperors, of Kings, and even of Republics, in a word, to any other authority except the paternal \*. But this matter would require us to follow all the windings of their mysterious language, a task that would be as tedious to my reader as to myself. I trust therefore that he will not be displeased with me for having spared him the labour of research, which I have endured in the task of gathering from amidst these *voluntary ob-*

\* Part II. Sect. 5. Art. ADULTERY.

*scurities* some of those luminous traits which now and then escape the sect; and the re-union of which leaves no doubt as to the grand object of this Apocalypse.

In reading over and studying this extraordinary code, one would be tempted to decide with Voltaire, *that there never was printed a more absurd, obscure, mad, or foolish work*; and we should be equally surprized that such a code had produced so many enthusiasts, or that we know not what *Dean* of Philosophy had been so much enchanted with it \*. But in all probability this *Dean* had not sent the word of the enigma to Voltaire; he had not told him that this voluntary obscurity was one of the most powerful means employed by the sect to crush the altar and the throne. The works of Voltaire himself had not the celebrity of Mr. de St. Martin's Apocalypse. The greater the obscurity the more it attracted the curiosity and piqued the vanity of his disciples; the adepts of the first class tutored and explained it to the young novices, and none were more eager than those of the fair sex. Their dressing-rooms were metamorphosed into secret schools, where the interpreting adept developed the mysteries of each page, and the novice in extasy applauded the mystery which was hidden from the vulgar. Little by little the novice herself became

\* Let. of Voltaire to D'Alembert, Oct. 22, 1776.



an interpreter, and founded a species of school.— This is not a mere assertion; such schools for the explanation of the code existed at Paris and in the Provinces, particularly at Avignon, the headquarters of the Martinists. I was and am acquainted with several persons who were introduced to these schools. They were the preparatory steps to initiation. There they learned the art of imposing on the simple by factitious apparitions, which ended by casting ridicule on the sect; the art of conjuring up the dead; the art of making absent persons speak, or of seeing them at a thousand miles distance; in fine, all those arts which quacks and mountebanks of all ages have invented to delude the populace, and rob them of their money, the Martinist studied to enable them to make converts to Impiety and Rebellion.

This sect made great progress in France and Germany; some even have reached England; and every where their grand object is to represent the French Revolution as the fire which is to purify the world.

Notwithstanding the multitude of the Martinist Masons, they are not nearly so numerous as the Eclectic Masons; and these indeed should naturally predominate in an age when the Philosophism of the Atheists and Deists only succeeds to the ancient heresies in order to absorb them all.

The

**Eclectic  
Masonry.**

The appellation of Eclectic is applied to a Free-mason, as it was formerly to certain Philosophers. We are to understand by this word those of the adepts who, after having passed through the different degrees of Masonry, attach themselves to no particular system, either political or religious, into which they have been initiated, but adopt from them all whatever may best suit their political or religious views \*. They are neither Hermetic, Cabalistic nor Martinist Masons ; they are what they please, Deists, Atheists, Sceptics, an aggregate of all the errors of the Philosophism of the day. They, like the simple Sophisters of the age, have a twofold point of union. With respect to Religion, they all admit that Liberty and Equality which denies every authority but their own reason, and rejects all revealed religion ; as to governments, they admit of no Kings, unless subservient to the will of the people in right of its sovereignty. I shall be very brief on this class ; it is that of the Brissots, Condorcets or Lalandes ; in a word of the Sophisters of the day, whom we shall soon see combining with Masonry to operate their Revolution. Were we to expose their systems it would only be a repetition of what has been said of the Sophisters conspiring against the altar and the throne ; and the multitude of these abettors of Impiety who

\* See the Archives of the Free-masons and Rosicrucians, Chap. 3. Edition of Berlin, 1785.

were

were in our time aggregated to the Masonic Lodges would alone prove how peculiarly such plots coincided with their principles.

I know that there is another species of Eclectic Masons lately established in Germany. These not only make profession of appertaining to no particular system of Masonry, but assert also that they depend on none. According to them, all are independent, all have the right of making their own laws. It is for that reason that they have abolished the very names of Grand Lodge and of Scotch Lodge: and in this respect they may be said to have improved upon Masonic Liberty and Equality\*.

In this light the Eclectic Masons could not have been very numerous in France, as the major part of them were under the inspection of the Grand Parisian Lodge called the *Grand Orient*. But our modern Sophisters had introduced into all the Lodges the true Eclectic spirit of Impiety; and sentiment was a stronger tie than a professed opinion. This sentiment, to be uniform, must agree in hating Christ and his Religion, in detesting all Sovereignty and all Legislative Power, except that of the people. The Eclectic Mason, like the Sophisters, are at liberty to substitute Deism or Atheism to Christianity, to replace Mo-

\* See the Rules of their Association, Frankfort, 18th May, 1783, signed Ruffner and Rottberg Secretaries.

narchy

narchy by Democracy or even by a Democratic Monarchy ; but a step less towards Liberty and Equality would suffice to banish him from the Occult Lodges.

All classes therefore, every code of Masonry, Hermetic, Cabalistic or Martinists, and *Eclectic*, all and each forwarded the Revolution; and it little imported to the sect which struck the blow, provided ruin ensued\*.

I promised to add to these proofs those which more particularly result from the divers opinions of Masons on their origin. Let us here again be only guided by the most learned and zealous of the sect. The reader will consider whether the parents they have adopted would not suffice alone to direct their judgement on the plots of their progeny.

\* La Metherie's Journal de Physique, 1790.

## CHAP. XII.

*Proofs of the Origin of Free-masons drawn from their own Systems.*

**LET** us begin by rejecting the opinions of all those demi-adepts, who in their research on Masonry, led away by the similarity of name, really believe themselves descended from the Masons who built the Tower of Babel, or who raised the pyramids of Egypt, or more particularly from those who erected Solomon's Temple, or who worked at the Tower of Strasbourg; in fine, of those who laid the foundations of so many Churches in Scotland in the tenth century. These men of mortar had never been admitted to the mysteries. If it be true that they ever constituted a part of the Brotherhood, they were soon excluded; their minds were too blunt and not sufficiently Philosophic\*.

\* I make this observation, as it is very possible that the name and implements of the Craft may be borrowed from the real Masons. Many mechanical arts, in France at least, had their signs, their ceremonies, their hidden language, which constituted the secret of the profession. This language and these signs served to distinguish the workmen, and denoted the

They were no longer wanted, when once the trowel, the compasses, the cubic stone, the truncated or entire columns, became nothing more than

the degree they had acquired, whether of *Apprentice* or *Master*; and was a method of recognizing those who on the road asked for work, or for support to enable them to continue their journey. For all men of the same profession are naturally inclined to help each other in preference to strangers.

It is very possible that in time some of the adepts initiated in the mysteries of the sect gained admission among the mechanical *Masons*. These adepts may have formed others among those mechanics. Then, to form a separate society, it was only necessary to adopt new signs, and choose different emblems from those workmen and the Lodges were ready formed.

What may corroborate this supposition is, that there exists in France another profession, which, had it not been for one obstacle, might have undergone a similar change. This is the profession of the *Fendeurs* (*Hewers of Wood*). These men also form a confraternity. They have their signs, their watchword, their secret and their convivial meetings. They call themselves *L'Ordre des Fendeurs* (*the Order of the Hewers of Wood*). They admit Gentlemen and Burgesses into their order, who are initiated into the secret, and attend their meetings and repasts in the same manner as the *Free-masons* do theirs. I have known men who were both *Masons* and *Fendeurs*, and who from their birth and stations in life had for other occupations than splitting of wood. They were as reserved with respect to the secret of the *Fendeurs* as to that of *Masonry*. I knew the sentiments of these adepts, and should not be surprised that the sole reason why they took so great an interest in the secret of the *Fendeurs* was from its similarity

than systematic emblems; and the learned adepts blush at an origin which they consider as too ignoble.

We will subdivide into two classes the divers Various opinions of Free-masons on their origin. opinions set forth in order to ennoble their origin. In the first class, we comprehend all those who ascend back to the mysteries of the Egyptian priests, to those of Eleusis or the Greeks, or those who pretend to filiate from the Druids, or even who call themselves descendants of the Jews. In the second class, we consider those who only trace

rity to that of Masonry, or else, that in time, our adepts of the town were in hopes of *Philosophizing* their brethren of the woods. The grand obstacle to the propagation of these principles would be the difficulty and infrequency of their meetings, which are held in the midst of forests, far from the eye of the profane, and only in fine weather. Should the Philosopher take it into his head to convert these repasts into those of Liberty and Equality, in a word, of the Golden Age, then adepts would flock in from all parts, Sophisticated dissertations and allegories would be introduced; but the unsouth inhabitant of the woods would no longer be able to comprehend the mysteries. Some of the signs would be changed, the emblems of the profession would be preserved, and the Sophisticated Lodges of the *Fendeurs* established in the towns would cease to be open to the clownish mechanics from whom they had adopted their allegorical emblems. It is very possible that such may have been the case with the Mechanical Masons. This however is no more than a conjecture as to the mode of the fest; our readers will soon see that we are not reduced to such uncertainty with regard to the origin of its secret and of its doctrine.

themselves

themselves from the Knights Templars, or the Age of the Crusades \*.

If

\* For these divers opinions let the reader consult from among the learned and zealous Masons of Germany, the *GESCHICHTE DER UNBEKANNTEN* or *the History of the Unknown*, 1780, with this Epigraph—*Gens aeterna est, in qua nemo nascitur*—*ARCHIV FÜR FREYMAURER*, or *the Archives of the Freemasons*, Berlin 1784—*ÜBER DIE ALTEN UND NEUEN MYSTERIEN*, or *of Ancient and Modern Mysteries*, Berlin 1782—*DIE HEBRAISCHE MYSTERIEN, ODER DIE ALTESTE RELIGIOSE FREYMAUREREY*, *the Mysteries of the Hebrews, or the most ancient religious Freemasonry*, Leipzig 1788. Among the English Masons he may consult *THE SPIRIT OF MASONRY* by *William Hutchinson*—and among the French *Guillemain de 'St. Victor ON THE ORIGIN OF MASONRY*, &c.

Let the reader remember that several of these works might have been quoted for the greatest absurdities that Masonry is guilty of. For example in the *ARCHIVES OF FREEMASONRY*, several dissertations are to be found written by their Doctors on the Cabalistic art, and that even by an English Doctor, for the defence and instruction of the Rosicrucians.—I was really confounded, and almost ashamed, when among other absurdities I read, “ASTROLOGY is a science which by the situation of the stars reveals the causes of what has come to pass and foretells what is to come. This science has had its blots, but that destroys neither the foundation nor the sanctity of the art.” And this is written by an English Doctor to justify the Rosicrucian Lodges, and to be preserved in their Archives. (*See these Archives in German, Part III. No. 18, Page 378*). I have added this quotation, because I am always afraid of its being said, that I attribute  
inac-



If we examine never so carefully the reasons on which the learned Masons ground their filiation from the ancient Philosophers, they will be found to contain merely this assertion : “ that in those ancient “ times when men first began to desert the primitive truths, to follow a religion and morality “ founded on superstition, some sages were to be “ met with who segregated themselves from the “ general mass of ignorance and corruption. These “ sages, perceiving that the grossness or the stupidity of the people rendered them incapable of “ profiting by their lessons, formed separate “ schools and disciples, to whom they transmitted “ the whole science of the ancient truths and of “ the discoveries they had made by their profound “ meditations on the nature, the religion, the “ polity, and the rights of man. In these lessons “ some insisted on the unity of God or true Deism, “ others on the unity of the Great Being, or Pantheism. The morality deduced from these principles was pure ; it was grounded on the duties “ of charity, on the rights of Liberty, and on the “ means of living peaceably and happily. Left

How and why the Freemasons trace back their origin.

incredible things to Freemasonry. I know that in one sense they are incredible, but it is so only to those who are strangers to the proofs. Were the books of Masonry in different languages to be consulted, especially those in German, they would be found to superabound in proofs.

VOL. II.

A a

“ these

“ these doctrines should lessen in value, should be  
 “ falsified or be entirely lost, these sages com-  
 “ manded their disciples to keep them secret.—  
 “ They also gave them signs and a particular  
 “ language by which they were to recognize each  
 “ other. All those who were admitted to this  
 “ school and to these mysteries were the children  
 “ of Light and Liberty, while all the rest of man-  
 “ kind were with respect to them but *slaves* and  
 “ *prophane beings*; and hence their contempt for  
 “ the vulgar. This was also the reason why the  
 “ disciples of Pythagoras observed such a pro-  
 “ found silence, the origin of that particular and  
 “ secret science of the divers schools. Hence the  
 “ mysteries of the Egyptians and afterwards of the  
 “ Greeks and of the Druids, even the very my-  
 “ steries of the Jews themselves, or of Moses ini-  
 “ tiated in all the secrets of the Egyptians.

“ These divers schools and the secrets of these  
 “ mysteries have not been lost; the Philosophers  
 “ of Greece transmitted them to those of Rome,  
 “ and the Philosophers of all nations followed the  
 “ same line of *conduct after the establishment of*  
 “ *Christianity*. The secret was always preserved,  
 “ because it was *necessary to avoid the persecutions*  
 “ *of an intolerant Church and of its Priests*. The  
 “ sages of divers nations by means of the signs  
 “ which had been originally established, recogni-  
 “ zed each other, as the Freemasons do every  
 “ where

“ where at this present day. The name only has  
 “ been changed ; and the secret has been handed  
 “ down under the denomination of Freemasonry,  
 “ as it was formerly under the sanction of the Magi,  
 “ of the Priests of Memphis or of Eleusis, and of  
 “ Platonic or Eclectic Philosophers. Such is the  
 “ origin of Masonry, such are the causes which  
 “ perpetuate it, and which render it the same in  
 “ all parts of the world \*.”

This is the faithful result of what the most  
 learned Masons have published on their origin.—  
 It is not our object to examine how false are such  
 ideas on the pretended doctrine of the Persian,  
 Egyptian, Grecian, Roman or Druid sages, nor  
 how contrary to all history. In the first place,  
 can any thing be more absurd than to suppose,  
 that there existed a unity of religious opinions, of  
 morality, and of secrets among Philosophers, who  
 have left behind them systems as variegated, and as  
 opposite to each other, and as absurd as those of  
 our modern sophisticated Philosophists † ? Nor do  
 I undertake to examine the erroneous assertion,

Falsity of  
 this ori-  
 gin.

\* An Extract from the Divers works cited in the Note.

† Let those who wish to be convinced of the discordancy of  
 those systems consult CICERO *Quæstiones Academ.*—*De Natura*  
*Deorum*—*De Legib.*—*De Finibus Boni et Mali.*—*De Off.* &c.—  
 or LACTANTIUS *Institut : Divin :*—or the last of the *Helvian*  
*Letters ;* where the doctrines, the systems, and the absurdities  
 of our modern Sophists are compared with those of the an-  
 cient sages.

A a 2

that

that the mysteries of Eleusis had no other secret but the unity of God, and the purest morality.—How is it possible to suppose that those mysteries were not universally known to the people, when it is certain that all the citizens of Athens were initiated into both the lesser and greater *mysteries*, according to their age\*? Nor do I ask how it came to pass, that these same Athenians underground were all taught their catechism on the unity of God, and how when above ground they adored such a multitude of Gods; or, again, how it happened that they condemned Socrates to death on the accusation that he did not adore all the Gods; or else, why all the Priests of the different idols only acquired by their initiation new zeal for the defence of that multitude of Gods and their altars. In fine, I will not ask how it is possible to persuade oneself that those Priests, so ardent and so zealous in their temples for the worship of Jupiter, of Mars, of Venus, and of so many other Deities, should be the very persons who assembled the people during the solemnity of the grand mysteries, to tell them that all their worship of the Gods was nothing but imposture, and that they themselves were the authors, ministers, or priests of imposture!

\* See Mr. de St. Croix's work on *the Mysteries of the Ancients*.

I know

I know that such reflections are more than sufficient to stamp with falsehood the origin in which the learned Masons glory. But let us for a moment suppose, that these mysteries were what they have represented them to be; the very pretension of a society springing from such ancestry and glorying in perpetuating their spirit and their Dogmas,—this pretension alone, I say, must class this Brotherhood among the most ancient conspirators. It would entitle us to say to the Craft, ‘ Such then is the origin of your mysteries; such the object of your Occult Lodges! You then descend from those pretended sages, and those Philosophers, who, reduced to the lights of reason, had no farther knowledge of the true God than what their reason inspired. You are the children of Deism or Pantheism, and, replete with the spirit of your forefathers, you wish to perpetuate it! Like them you look upon every thing which the rest of mankind have learned from the lights of Revelation, as superstition and prejudice. Every Religion which adds to the worship of the Theist or detests the Pantheist, in a word Christianity and its mysteries, are with you objects of hatred and contempt! You abhor whatever the Sophists of Paganism, or the Sophists initiated in the mysteries of the idolatrous Priests abhorred;—but those Sophists detested Christianity, and showed themselves its most inveterate enemies. From your own

A a 3

avowals,

avowals, then, in what light can we view your mysteries, if not as a perpetuation of that hatred and of that wish of annihilating every other Religion but the pretended Deism of the Ancients?

‘ You also say that you are what those Jews were, and still are, who, for all their religious tenets, only acknowledge the unity of God (provided there have existed Jews who did not believe in the Prophets and in *Emmanuel* the Saviour).— You have then the same sentiments toward the Christian which the Jews have. Like them, you insist on *Jehovab*, but to curse Christ and his mysteries \*.’

The

• As for this Jewish part of the Craft, or the Freemasonry of the Jews, we recommend to our reader to peruse the treatise of a most learned and zealous Mason dedicated *Denen die es Verstehen, or to those who can understand*. He leaves no stone unturned throughout antiquity to prove the identity of the ancient mysteries of Eleusis, of the Jews, of the Druids, and of the Egyptians, with those of Freemasonry. And indeed when we reflect on the pretended history of the name of *Jehovab* lost by the assassination of Adoniram, it may be very probable that the Jews had had a part in Masonry, “ As it is “ drawn from the *Chaldaic Paraphrase*, and taken from a “ fable invented by the Rabbins to rob Christ of his divinity “ and power. They supposed, that Christ being one day in “ the Temple of Jerusalem had seen the Holy of Holies, “ where the High Priest alone had a right to enter. That “ he there saw the name of *Jehovab*—That he carried it “ away with him—and that in virtue of this ineffable name “ he

The more the Masonic works above-mentioned are read, the more conspicuous will be the justice of the reproaches we make. With some, matter is eternal; with others, the Trinity of the Christians is only an alteration of Plato's system.—Others again adopt the follies of the Martinists, or of the ancient Dualism\*. Nothing then can be more evident. All these learned Masons who pretend to descend from the Egyptian Priests, from those of Greece, or from the Druids, only seek to establish what may appear to each to be the religion of nature. Nor do they vary less as to its tenets than did both the ancient and modern Sophists. They all agree in destroying faith in the minds of their adepts, by systems in direct opposition to Christianity. If they do not run into wild declamation like Voltaire, Diderot, or Raynal, it is because they wished themselves to deduce their consequences. To have expressed them too openly would have been divulging their mysteries; but one must be more than ignorant not to comprehend their meaning—How can we be blind to

“ he had wrought his miracles.” (See the Voile Levé).—The whole of this Fable is evidently directed against the tenets of the Christians on the Divinity of Christ. The importance which Masons annex to the recovering of the name of Jehovah, and particularly all their mysteries in the degree of *Rose Crucis*, has the same object in view.

\* See particularly the letter *Aux Illustres Inconnus*, or to the Real Freemasons, 1782.

A a 4

their

their intentions, when we peruse the writings of those who declare themselves to have originated in the Templars, or in those sectaries who infested all Europe under the name of Albigeois? These two sources have more analogy between them than may be supposed. Let us examine *them separately*, and then judge what we have to expect from men who glory in such an origin.

Of Free-  
maçons  
attri-  
buting  
their ori-  
gin to the  
Tem-  
plars.

As to the Templars, let us even suppose that this famous order was really innocent of all the crimes which occasioned its dissolution; what object either religious or political can the Freemasons have in perpetuating their mysteries under the name or emblems of that order? Had the Templars brought into Europe a religion, or a code of morality, that was not known? Is that their inheritance?—In that case neither your religion nor your morality can be that of Christ. Is it their fraternity, their charity, which is the object of your secrets? Did the Templars really add any thing to those Evangelic virtues? Or is it the religion of *Jehovah*, or of the Unity of God, coinciding with the mysteries of Christianity?—If so, why do you reject all *Christians* who are *not Masons*, as *prophane*?

It is too late to reply, that the alarms of religion are vain and ungrounded; that religion never was the object of the Lodges. What then is that name, that worship of *Jehovah*, which the learned

Masons



Masons declare to have been handed down from the Knights Templars. Whether these Knights were the authors of it, or whether they received it by tradition, or borrowed it from the ancient mysteries of Paganism and of its fables, this name I say, this worship cannot be foreign to Christianity; and is not every Christian entitled to say, 'You would not be so secret nor so ardent to revenge it, if it were similar to the worship established throughout the Christian world?'

Should governments partake of the same alarms, to what subterfuge will the adepts have recourse who have sworn to avenge Liberty, Equality, and every right of their association, which has been so desperately outraged in the destruction of the Templars? It will be in vain to assert the innocence real or fictitious of those too famous Knights. That vow of vengeance which has been perpetuated for nearly five centuries can hardly fall on *Philip le Bel* or *Clement V.* or on the other Kings and Pontiffs who in the beginning of the fourteenth century contributed to the dissolution of that order? Nor will it be renewed in these days on account of the ties of blood, or through any pity for the particular individuals of the order? This vow, this oath of vengeance must be instigated by other causes—It has been perpetuated as the very object, the very doctrine of the school, as the principles and mysteries which the Masons have

have received from the Templars. What then can those men those principles be, which can only be avenged by the death of Kings and Pontiffs? And what are those Lodges wherein for four hundred and fourscore years this vow this oath of vengeance has been perpetuated?

It is evident: Nor is it necessary in this place to examine whether *Molay* and his order were innocent or criminal, whether they were the real progenitors of the Freemasons or not; what is incontestable is sufficient; it is enough that the Masons recognize them for their ancestors; then the oath of avenging them and every allegory recalling that oath decidedly points out an association, continually threatening and conspiring against Religion and its Pontiffs, against Empires and their Governors.

But it may be asked, what lights can history throw on such an intimate connection between the mysteries of Masonry and the order of Templars? Such a question requires much research, nor will I withhold from my reader the result of the inquiries which I have made on that subject.

Of the trials and depositions of the Templars.

The order of the Knights Templars established by Hugo de Paganis, and confirmed by Pope Eugenius III. was originally founded with all that charity which Christian zeal could inspire, for the service of those Christians who, according to the devotion of the times, went to visit the Holy Land.

Land. At first mere Hospitallers, these Knights, following the manners of the age, soon acquired great celebrity by their exploits against the Saracens. Their first repute originated in the services which were naturally to be expected from their great valor and eminent virtues : and such is the general testimony which history bears in their favour, making a wide distinction between the former and latter part of their existence. The Order soon spread through Europe, and acquired immense riches. They then began to forget their religious state, courted only the celebrity of the field, and were no longer led to it by the same spirit. It is worthy of remark, that many years before their dissolution, history already reproached them not only with being lax in their former virtue, but with those very crimes which caused their destruction. In the very zenith of their glory, and at a time when it required much courage to upbraid them with their vices, we see *Matthew Paris* accusing them of converting into darkness the lights of their predecessors, of having abandoned their first vocation for plans of ambition, pleasure, and debauchery, and of unjust and tyrannical usurpation. They were already accused of holding correspondence with the Infidels, which rendered abortive all the plans of the Christian Princes ; they were accused particularly of having treasonably communicated the whole of Frederic

ric

ric II.'s plan to the Soudan of Babylon, who, detesting such perfidy, informed the Emperor of the treachery of the Templars \*. This testimony, to which the Historian may add many others, will serve to render less surprizing the catastrophe which befel this famous order †.

In the reign of *Philip le Bel*, two men who had been imprisoned for their crimes declared that they had some important discoveries to make concerning the Knights Templars. Such a declaration under circumstances so peculiar could not be thought entitled to much credit; it sufficed nevertheless to make the King determine on the dissolution of the order, and he caused all the Templars in his kingdom to be arrested on the same day. This step may be thought too precipitate: But interrogatories and a thorough examination followed; and it is on those proofs alone, and the authentic minutes of that examination, that the Historian is to found his judgment. If their avowals are perfectly free, numerous, and coincident with each other, not only in different tribunals, but in different countries, enormous as their crimes may have been, still we are forced to believe them, or reject all history, and the juridical acts of the tribunals. These juridical minutes

\* See Matthew Paris, ann. 1229.

† See Abbas Vispurgiensis in Chronica, an. 1227 & Sanut. Lib. III. Part 12, Cap. 17, &c. apud Dupuy *Traité sur la condamnation des Templiers*.

have

have survived the ravages of time, and their importance has caused them to be preserved in great numbers. Let the Historian refer to the collection made by Mr. Dupuy, the King's librarian; I know no other way of forming one's judgment, and of dissipating prejudices.

It has been said, that *Philip le Bel* and *Clement V.* had concerted between them the dissolution of the Templars. The falsity of such an assertion is evident on the inspection of their letters. *Clement V.* at first will give no credit to the accusations against the Templars; and even when he receives incontestable proofs from *Philip le Bel*, he had still so little concerted the plan with that Prince, that every step taken by the one or the other occasions disputes on the rights of the Church or of the Throne.

It was also said, that the King wished to seize on the great riches of these Knights; but at the very commencement of his proceedings against the order, he solemnly renounced all share in their riches; and perhaps no Prince in Christendom was truer to his engagement. Not a single estate was annexed to his domain, and all history bears testimony to the fact\*.

We next hear of a spirit of revenge which actuated this Prince; and during the whole course of

\* Layette, Tom. III. No. 13.—Rubeus Hist. Ravanensis—Bzovius ann. 1308.—Marianna Hist. Hispaniæ.

this

this long trial, we do not hear of a single personal offence that he had to revenge on the Templars. In their defence not the most distant hint either at the revengeful spirit, or at any personal offence against the King is given; so far from it, until the period of this great catastrophe the Grand Master of the order had been a particular friend of the King's, who had made him godfather to one of his children.

In fine, the rack and torture is supposed to have forced confessions from them which otherwise they never would have made; and in the minutes we find the avowal of at least two hundred Knights all made with the greatest freedom and without any coercion. Compulsion is mentioned but in the case of one person, and he makes exactly the same avowal as twelve other Knights, his companions, freely made\*. Many of these avowals were made in *Councils* where the Bishops begin by declaring that all who had confessed through fear of the torture should be looked upon as innocent, and that no Knight Templar should be subjected to it†. The Pope, *Clement V.* was so far from favouring the King's prosecutions, that he began by declaring them all to be void and null. He suspended the Archbishops, Bishops, and Prelates, who had acted

\* Layette, No. 20, Interrog. made at Caen.

† See the Council of Ravenna. Rubens Hist. Raven. Lib. VI.

as inquisitors in France. The King accuses the Pope in vain of favouring the Templars; and *Clement* is only convinced after having been present at the interrogatories of seventy-two Knights at Poitiers in presence of many Bishops, Cardinals, and Legates. He interrogated them not like a Judge who sought for criminals, but like one who wished to find innocent men, and thus exculpate himself from the charge of having favored them. He hears them repeat the same avowals, and they are freely confirmed. He desired that these avowals should be read to them after an interval of some days, to see if they would still freely persevere in their depositions. He hears them all confirmed.

*Qui perseverantes in illis, eas expresse et sponte prout recitata fuerant approbârunt.* He wished still further to interrogate the Grand Master and the principal superiors, *præceptores majores*, of the divers provinces of France, Normandy, Poitou, and of the Transmarine countries. He sent the most venerable persons to interrogate those of the superiors whose age or infirmities hindered them from appearing before him. He ordered the depositions of their brethren to be read to them, to know if they acknowledged the truth of them. He required no other oath from them than to answer freely and without compulsion; and both the Grand Master and the superiors of these divers provinces depose and confess the same things,

con-

confirm them some days after, and approve of the minutes of their depositions taken down by public notaries \*. Nothing less than such precautions could convince him of his error : it was then only that he revoked his menaces and his suspension of the French Bishops, and that he allows the King to proceed in the trials of the Templars.

Let such pretexts be forgotten, and let us only dwell on the avowals which truth alone forced from these criminal knights.

Result of  
their  
avowals.

Their depositions declare, that the Knights Templars on their reception denied Christ, trampled on the cross, and spit upon it ; that Good Friday was a day which was particularly consecrated to such outrages ; that they promised to prostitute themselves to each other for the most unnatural crimes ; that every child begotten by a Templar was cast into the fire ; that they bound themselves by oath to obey without exception every order coming from the Grand Master ; to spare neither sacred nor profane ; to look upon

\* Qui Magister & Præceptores Franciæ, Terræ ultra-mariniæ, Normandiæ, Acquitaniæ ac Pictaviæ, coram ipsis tribus Cardinalibus præsentibus, quatuor tabellionibus publicis et multis aliis bonis viris, ad Sancta Dei Evangelia ab eis corporaliter tacta, præsteto juramento quod super præmissis omnibus, meram et plenam dicerent veritatem, coram ipsis, singulariter, liberè ac spontè, absque coactione qualibet et timore, deposuerunt et confessi fuerunt. (*Epist. Clementis V. Regibus Angliæ, Galliæ, Siciliæ, &c.*)

every



every thing as lawful when the good of the order was in question; and above all, never to violate the horrible secrets of their nocturnal mysteries under pain of the most terrible chastisements\*.

In making their depositions many of them declared they had only been forced into these horrors by imprisonment and the most cruel usage; that they wished, after the example of many of their brethren, to pass into other orders, but that they did not dare, fearing the power and vengeance of their order. That they had secretly confessed their crimes and had craved absolution. In this public declaration they testified by their tears the most ardent desire of being reconciled to the church.

Clement V. convinced at length, conceives whence the treachery proceeded, of which the Christian Princes so often complained they had been the victims in their wars against the Saracens. He permits the trials of the Templars to be continued, and a hundred and forty are heard in Paris.

All repeat the same deposition, except three, who declare they have no knowledge of the crimes imputed to their order. The Pope, not content with this information taken by Religious and by

\* See the Vouchers brought by Dupuy, and Extract of the Registers.

French Noblemen, requires that a new trial should take place in Poitou before Cardinals and others whom he himself nominates: Again, with the same freedom and for the third time, the Grand Master and other Chiefs in presence of Clement V. repeat their depositions. Molay even requested that one of the Lay Brothers who was about his person should be heard, and this Brother confirms the declaration. During many years these informations were continued and renewed at Paris, in Champagne, in Normandy, in Quercy, in Languedoc, in Provence. In France alone above two hundred avowals of the same nature are to be found; nor did they vary in England, where at the synod of London, held in 1311, seventy-eight English Knights were heard, and two whole months were spent in taking informations and in verifying their declarations. Fifty-four Irish were also heard, and many Scotch, in their respective countries. It was in consequence of these declarations, that the order of the Templars was abolished in those kingdoms, and that the Parliament disposed of their goods \*. The same declarations were taken and proved in Italy, at Ravenna, at Bologna, at Pisa, and at Florence, though in all these councils the Prelates were very ready to absolve all those Knights who could succeed in their justifications.

\* Vide Valsinger in Edvardum II. et Ypodigma Neustris apud Dupuy.—Essai de Fred. Nicolai.

When

When I hear the crimes of this order called in question, it appears to me that a sufficient attention has not been paid to the multiplicity of the avowals of these Knights, and of the diversity of nations which judged them. It would be one of the most extraordinary facts in history to see two hundred of these Knights accusing themselves of the greatest abominations. It would be a still greater atrocity to see so many Bishops, Noblemen, Magistrates, and Sovereigns, of different nations, sitting in judgment on the Templars, and publishing to the world, as free and uncontrolled, declarations which had only been extorted from them by the fear of torture. Such a conduct would be still more horrible than that of the Templars themselves; and would it not be equally extraordinary to see so many different nations agreeing to use the rack to extort such depositions from them? But for the honor of humanity such means were not employed in the trials of the Templars, by the Bishops and Grand Bailiffs, the King's Commissaries, the Cardinals, and Commissaries of Clement V. nor by himself in France. Such methods were not resorted to by the councils nor by the tribunals of other nations. Never was a cause of greater importance pleaded; and, from the numerous and authentic documents which are still extant, it is evident, that Judges never were more fearful of confounding the innocent with the guilty.

B b 2

Let

Let not the dissolution of another celebrated order, though in a very different way, be objected. The Jesuits were abolished, but they were not brought to trial; not a single member of the order has been heard in its defence, nor have any members deposed against it. I should be the first to condemn them, could proofs similar to those against the Templars, be adduced against them.

Let us for a moment suppose the Templars entirely innocent of the crimes imputed to them, what could have been the virtue and courage of an order, which could demean itself so much, as to make such declarations against itself? How can the Free-masons glory in such an ancestry, who, if their crimes were not monstrous, must themselves have been monsters of the basest cowardice.

The vulgar may be led away by the tardy protestations of Guy and Molay; but do the vulgar ever distinguish between the obstinacy of despair and that serene firmness and constancy which are the attendants on virtue? They are not aware that false honor, like truth, may have its martyrs. During three years Molay persevered in his avowal, and he repeated it at least three times; when he pretends at length to deny it, his expressions are those of rage, and he throws down the gauntlet to whoever shall pretend to assert that he *had made any deposition* against his order; at the place of execution he declares *that all that he had said against*  
his

his order was false, and that if he deserved death it was *for having accused his order falsely* both before the Pope and the King. Amidst these contradictions, can the Historian receive such protestations of innocence? Much less is he to attend to the popular fable of Molay having cited Philip le Bel and Clement V. to the tribunal of God within a year and a day, and that both the Pope and the King died within the year; for history not only varies as to the day, but even as to the year of Molay's execution\*.

As

\* It has been said to have taken place in the different years 1311, 1312, and 1313. The first of these dates appears to me to be correct, because the execution of the Grand Master certainly took place while the Commissaries of the Pope were at Paris, and they only resided there from August 1309 till May 1311. It is in vain to alledge the protest of the Abbot of St. Germain as Lord of the Manor against the execution of two Knights Templars on his land; for, supposing this regarded the execution of Guy and Molay, we have the answer to the protest in date March 1313, whereas Clement V. only died on the 20th April 1314; so that even in that case the citation must have been of no avail.

Boccacio, who is so often quoted on the death of Molay, does not so much as mention it. When people make such a display of what this author has said concerning the constancy of the Grand Master and the other Templars executed at the same time, some attention should be also paid to his commencing with saying, that "these Knights were strangely fallen off, on account of their great riches, from their pristine virtue; that they were ambitious, voluptuous, and effemi-

B b 3

nate;

As a last resource in defence of the order, the very nature and infamy of the crimes of which the Templars were accused have been alledged as a proof of their innocence. But most certainly the more infamous those crimes, the more debased must have been the members of the order to accuse each other of them. But all these crimes, however infamous and incredible, only serve to discover the abominable sect which introduced them among their adepts, and from whom the Templars evidently learned their frightful mysteries. That

nate; that so far from making war in defence of the Christians, according to their institute, they left that duty to be discharged by people whom they had hired, or by valets; and that in the days of *Jaques Molay* their virtues had degenerated into vices." All that Boccacio says afterwards on the constancy and death of the Grand Master and his companions, which so greatly excites his enthusiasm, is solely grounded on the account his father gave him, who was a merchant and at Paris at that time; his ideas on the subject, as is easily perceived, are merely those of the vulgar. I shall always return to the same point. Let us examine the authentic documents and the minutes of the proceedings. When they are to be had, and they still exist in great numbers, they are real points by which we are to be guided. Such has been the line of conduct (the only satisfactory one) held by Mr. Dupuy, in his *Treatise on the Condemnation of the Templars*. This work is written with candor; and though he has not made the most of his proofs, he abounds in authentic documents and extracts from the minutes of the trials, and furnishes far more than are necessary to satisfy our judgment.

hatred

hatred of Christ, that execrable immorality, even to the atrocious infanticide, all are to be found in the tenets, they are even in the principles of that incoherent medley of *Begards, Catbares*, and of that shoal of sectaries which flocked from the East to the Western States about the beginning of the eleventh century.

I would willingly assert that it was the smaller part of the Templars who suffered themselves to be carried away by such abominations. Some even at Paris were declared innocent. In Italy a still greater number were absolved; of all those who were judged at the Councils of Mayence and Salamanca, none were condemned; and hence we may conclude, that of the nine thousand houses belonging to the order many had not been tainted, and that whole provinces were to be excepted from the general stain of infamy. But the condemnations, the juridical depositions, the method of initiating the knights, almost become general; the secrecy of their receptions, where neither Prince nor King, nor any person whatever, could be present during the last half century, are so many testimonies which corroborate the divers accusations contained in the articles sent to the Judges; that is to say, that at least two thirds of the order knew of the abominations practiced, without taking any steps to extirpate them. *Quod omnes, vel quasi duæ*

B b 4

partes

*partes ordinis scientes dictos errores corrigere neglexerint.*

This certainly cannot mean that two thirds of the Knights had equally partaken of these abominations. It is evident on the contrary, that many detested them as soon as they were acquainted with them; and that others only submitted to them, though initiated, after the harshest treatment and most terrible threats. Nevertheless, this proves that the greatest part of these Knights were criminal, some through corruption, others through weakness, or connivance; and hence the dissolution of the order became necessary.

Another reflection which strikes me as being of weight, though I do not know that any one has made it, is, that between thirty and forty thousand Knights not only survived the condemnation of the order, but also survived Philip le Bel and Clement V. The greater part of these had only been condemned to canonical penance, to so many days fasting or prayer, or to a short imprisonment.— They lived in different parts of the world, where they had nothing to fear from *their persecutors and tyrants*. Conscience, honour, and many other motives, should have induced these survivors to make their recantations after having made juridical depositions of such an abominable nature against their order; most certainly if they had made them through fear or seduction, it was a duty incumbent  
on



on them. Nevertheless, of those thousands of Knights heard in so many different states there is not a single one that makes his retraction, not one who leaves such a declaration to be published after his death. What men then are these Knights? If their depositions be true, how monstrous must that order have been by its crimes; if they be false, what monsters of calumny was it composed of? That fear may have made them swerve from truth during the reign of Philip le Bel, I will admit; but that King being dead, what becomes of such a plea.

Such nevertheless are the men whom the Masons glory in their descent from. Yes, and their descent is real. Their pretensions are no longer chimerical. Were they to deny it we should force them to recognize as their progenitors not the whole of the order, but that part whose ancient corruption and obstinate hatred against the altar and the throne, when added to their thirst of revenge, must render them still more formidable to both Kings and Pontiffs.

Were we to trace the descent of the Freemasons by the Templars, we should not have the assurance of those who suppose the Grand Master Molay, when in the Bastile, creating the four *Lodges*, that of Naples for the East, of Edinburgh for the West, of Stockholm for the North,  
and

and of Paris for the South\*. Yet, following nothing but the archives of the Freemasons themselves, and the apparent affinities which subsist between them and the Knights Templars, we are entitled to say to them—‘ Yes, the whole of your school and all your Lodges descend from the Templars. After the extinction of their order a certain number of criminal Knights, who had escaped the general proscription, formed a body to perpetuate their frightful mysteries. To their pre-existing code of Impiety they added the vow of vengeance against Kings and Pontiffs who had destroyed their order, and against all Religion, which proscribed their tenets. They formed adepts who were to perpetuate and transmit from generation to generation the same mysteries of iniquity, the same

\* This account is to be found in an Almanac printed at Paris under the title of *Etrennes Intéressantes* 1796-97. I don’t know from whence the writer has drawn this anecdote, nor on what grounds he says that the Duke of Sundermania, as Grand Master of the Mother Lodge of the North, was accessory to the assassination of the King his brother by Anckarström. Though this writer shows some knowledge of the Craft, he is so ignorant in other respects that it is impossible to take him for an authority :—For example, he says, that the Jesuits were Freemasons, that it was they who poisoned the Emperor Henry VII. and that Emperor died *two hundred years* before a Jesuit existed. This fable of the Jesuits Freemasons is an artifice devised by the Illuminés, and we shall see them own to it, to avert the attention of states from their own sect and conspiracies.

oaths,

oaths, and the same hatred against the God of the Christians, Kings and Priests.—These mysteries have descended to you, and you perpetuate their impiety, their oaths, and hatred.—Such is your origin. Length of time, the manners of each age may have varied some of your signs and of your shocking systems; but the essence is the same, the wishes, oaths, hatred and plots are similar—You would not think it, but every thing betrayed your forefathers, and every thing betrays their progeny.’

Let us then compare the tenets, language, and signs. What a similarity, and how many are common to both!

In the mysteries of the Templars the initiator begins by opposing the God who cannot die to the God who dies on the cross for the salvation of mankind. “Swear,” he says to the candidate, “that you believe in a God the Creator of all things, “who neither did nor will die;” and then follow blasphemies against the God of Christianity. The new adept is taught to say, that Christ was but a false prophet, justly condemned in expiation of his own crimes and not of those of mankind. *Receptores dicebant illis quos recipiebant, Christum non esse verum Deum et ipsum fuisse falsum Prophetam; non fuisse passum pro redemptione humani generis, sed pro sceleribus suis* \*. Can any one here mistake the

\* 2d Art. of their Avowals. See Dupuy, page 48.

Jeho-

Jehovah of the Masons, or the Jew of Nazareth led by Raphael into Judea to suffer for his crimes \*?

The God of the Templars, which *never could die*, was represented by the *head* of a man, before which they prostrated themselves as before their real idol. This head is to be found in the *Masonic Lodges* in Hungary, where Free-masonry has preserved the greatest number of its original superstitions †.

This head is to be found again in the *Magic Mirror* of the Cabalistic Masons. They call it the Being of Beings, and reverence it under the title of SUM (*I am*). It represents their great *Jehovah*, source of all beings. And we may look upon it as one of the links which compose the general chain by which the Historian may connect the History of Masonry with that of the Templars.

\* See above, page 312.

† See Kleiser's Report to the Emperor Joseph II. I never saw this Report written by Kleiser, whom the Emperor Joseph II. had ordered to get himself received, that he might know what he ought to depend upon with respect to the Masons and Illuminés. The Report was printed by order of the Emperor; but the Free-masons and Illuminés bought it up with such rapidity, that scarcely a copy escaped them. I am acquainted with a Nobleman who has read and even made extracts from it; and it was through his means that I learned this anecdote concerning the head being preserved in the Hungarian Lodges. It appears that some of the Templars revered it as the head of their first founder, while others worshipped it, as the image of the God whom they adored.

These

These same Knights in hatred to Christ celebrated the mysteries of *Jehovah* more particularly on Good Friday, *præcipue in die Veneris Sanctæ*; and it is the same hatred which assembles the Rosicrucians on that day, according to their statutes, to dedicate it more particularly to their blasphemies against the God of Christianity.

Among the Templars, Liberty and Equality was masked under the name of Fraternity.

Qu'il est bon, qu'il est doux, de vivre en freres \*.

was the favorite canticle during their mysteries. It has since been adopted by the Masons, and is the mask that conceals all their political errors.

The Templars were bound to secrecy by the most terrible oaths, subjected themselves to the vengeance of the Brethren and to death itself, if ever they revealed the mysteries of the order. *Injungebant eis per sacramentum, ne prædicta revelarent sub pœna mortis*. The same oath subsists among the Masons, and the same threats for any one who shall violate secrecy.

The precautions lest any *profane being* should be present at their mysteries are similar. The Templars always began by sending out of their houses whoever was not initiated. Armed brethren were placed at the doors to keep off all curious people, and sentries were placed on the roofs of their houses, which they always called Temples †.

\* How pleasing, how happy it is to live like brethren. † Ibid.  
Hence

Hence originates the *Brother Terrible, or the Tyler*, who stands at the doors with a drawn sword, to defend the entrance of the Lodge against the prophane multitude. Hence that common expression among Masons the *Temple is covered*, to say the sentries are placed; no prophane Being can gain admittance, not even by the roof, we may now act with full liberty. Hence also the expression *it rains*, signifying the Temple is not covered, the Lodge is not guarded, and we may be seen and over-heard.

Thus every thing to the very symbols\*, their language, the very names of *Grand Master*, of *Knight*, of *Temple*, even to the columns *Jacbin and Boaz*, which decorated the Temple of Jerusa-

\* Without doubt there is a variety of other symbols which do not come from the Knights Templars, such are the flaming star, the sun, the moon, and the stars. The learned Masons in their secret journal of Vienna attribute these to the founder of the Rosicrucians, called Brother *Ros-Cruz*. He was a Monk of the thirteenth century, who imported both his magic and mysteries from Egypt. He died, after having initiated some few disciples, who for a long time formed a separate association; they at length united with the Free-masons, and formed one of their occult degrees. Or it would be more correct to say that there exists now a-days in this degree nothing more than the name and the magic art of the ancient Rosicrucians, with the stars and other symbols borrowed from the firmament. Every other part is confounded with, and merged in, the mysteries and plots of Masonry.

lem,

lem, and which are supposed to have been given to the care of the Templars, all in a word betray our Free-masons to be the descendants of those proscribed Knights. But what 'a damning proof' do we not find in those trials, where the candidate is taught to strike with his poniard the pretended assassin of their Grand Master\*; in common with the Templars it is on Philip le Bel that they wreak their vengeance; and in every other King the sect behold this pretended assassin. Thus with all the blasphemous mysteries against Christ we see them perpetuating those mysteries of vengeance, hatred, and combination against Kings. The Masons then are correct when they claim the proscribed Knights for their forefathers. The same plans, the same means, the same horrors could not be more faithfully transmitted from father to son.

We shall conclude this chapter by a few observations which will not leave any subterfuge to those who may still entertain doubts concerning the crimes that brought dissolution on this proscribed order. Let us suppose the whole of this order to have been perfectly innocent of all the accusations of impiety, or of principles dangerous to governments. It is not in this state of innocence that they are recognized by the Masons as their

\* See above, page 322.

fore-

forefathers. The profound adepts only acknowledge the Templars as their progenitors, because they are convinced that those Knights were guilty of the same impiety and of the same plots as themselves. It is in these crimes alone, and in these conspiracies, that they recognize their masters; and as infidels and conspirators it is that they invoke them.

Under what title do the Condorcets and the Syeyes, under what title does Fauchet or Mirabeau, Guillotin or Lalande, Bonneville or Volney, and so many others who are known to be at once the profoundest adepts of Masonry and the heroes of Impiety and Revolutionary Rebellion—under what title can such men challenge the Knights Templars as their progenitors, if not because they believe that they have inherited those principles of Liberty and Equality which are no other than hatred to Christ and hatred to Kings? When Condorcet, summing up the studious research of thirty years, falsifying all the facts of history, and combining all the cunning of Sophistry to extort our gratitude for those *secret associations destined to perpetuate privately and without danger among a few adepts*, what he calls *a small number of plain truths, as certain preservatives against the predominant prejudices*; when he extols the French Revolution as the triumph so long preparing and expected by these *secret societies*; when he promises to solve the question



question hereafter, whether the Knights Templars, whose dissolution was the summit of *barbarity and meanness*, are not to be numbered among these associations \*. When he holds such language, under what point of view can the Knights Templars have inspired him with such deep concern? With him, these secret associations, so deserving of our gratitude, are those of the pretended sages, “ indignant at seeing nations oppressed, even in the sanctuary of their consciences, by Kings the superstitious or political slaves of the priesthood.” They are the associations of those generous men who dare examine the foundations of all power or authority, and who revealed to the people the great truths, *that their Liberty is inalienable; that no prescription can exist in behalf of tyranny; that no convention can irrevocably subject a nation to any particular family: That Magistrates, whatever may be their titles, functions, or powers, are only the officers, and not the masters of the people: That the people always preserve the right of revoking those powers emanating from them alone, whether they judge it has been abused, or consider it to be useless to continue them. In short, that the people have the right of punishing the abuse as well as of revoking the power †.*”

\* *Esquisse des Progres, &c. Epoque 7.*

† *Ibid. Epoque 8.*

Thus we see Condorcet tracing back the germ at least of all the principles of the French Revolution to these *secret associations*, which he represents as the benefactors of nations, and as preparing the triumph of the multitude against the altar and the throne. All therefore he does or promises to do in future, when he proposes the question, whether the Knights Templars are not to be numbered among those secret associations, can only originate in the hope of tracing to them principles, oaths, and means which in time would operate similar revolutions. All this zeal of Condorcet for the secret association of the Templars, is no other than the hopes of finding them guilty of that same hatred against Royalty and the Priesthood with which his own heart is inflamed.

The secret which he has half disclosed more daring adepts have betrayed ; it has escaped them amidst their declamations. In the delirium of fury, and in the cavern as it were of their regicide trials, they publicly invoke the *recking dagger*, they exclaim to their brethren, " Let the interval  
 " of ages disappear and carry nations back to the  
 " persecutions of Philip le Bel—*You who are or*  
 " *are not Templars*—help a free people to build  
 " in three days and for ever, a Temple in honor  
 " of Truth—*May tyrants perish*, and may the  
 " earth be delivered from them \* !"

\* Bonneville Esprit des Religions, p. 156, 157, 175, &c.  
 Such

Such then is the explanation which the profound adepts give of the mysterious names of *Philip le Bel* and of the Templars. The first recalls to their mind, that in all Revolutions Kings are to be immolated, and the second, that there existed a set of men leagued in the oath of delivering the earth from its Kings. That is what they call restoring Liberty to the people, and building the Temple of Truth!—I had long feared to exaggerate the depravity and the plots of the proscribed Knights; but what crimes can history impute to them which are not comprehended in this terrible invocation of the adepts at the dawn of the Revolution? It is when they grow more daring, and stimulate each other to those crimes which overthrow the altar and the throne; it is at that period that the most furious adepts, at once Masons and Jacobins, recall the name and the honor of the Templars to be avenged, and their oaths and plots to be accomplished. The Templars were then, what the Jacobin Masons are at this day; their mysteries were those of the Jacobins.—It is not to us that objections are to be made on this accusation. Let the profound adepts of Masonry and Jacobinism defend their own assertions; let the offspring be persuaded that they have wronged their forefathers: And even could that be demonstrated, still it would be evident that the mysteries of the Occult Lodges consist in that

hatred of the altar and the throne, and in those oaths of rebellion and impiety, which the adepts extol as their inheritance from the Templars. Still it would be evident that the oath (the essence of Jacobinism) of overturning the altar and the throne is the last mystery of the Occult *Masons*, and that they only recognize the Templars as their progenitors, because they believed the mysteries of those famous though proscribed Knights contained all the principles, oaths, and wishes which operated the French Revolution.

---

## CHAP. XIII.

*Farther Declarations of the Free-masons as to their Origin.*

*The real Founder of Masonry.—True and first Origin of their Mysteries and of all their Systems.*

THE learned adepts were not mistaken when they numbered the Knights Templars in the ancestry of Free-masons. We have seen by the comparative statement of their mysteries how much they coincided with each other ; but it still remains to be shown whence the Templars had received their systems of impiety. This observation has not escaped those of the adepts who gloried so much in the impiety of their mysteries. They have extended their researches with that view, to ascertain whether there had not existed some of *those secret associations* in Europe whence they might trace their origin prior to the Templars. The Sophister, the famous adept shall speak. The result of his researches are only announced ; death cut the thread of those ideas which he had promised to develop in the extensive work he was

C c 3

medi-

meditating on the *progreſs of the human mind*, and of which his admirers have only publiſhed the general plan under the title of *Esquisſe d'un Tableau general ſur les Progrès de l'Esprit humain* (*Sketch of a general Table of the Progreſs of the Human Mind*). But in this Sketch we find more than ſufficient to diſſipate the remaining cloud, and to rend the veil which as yet the adepts had not thought prudent entirely to withdraw. The text of this famous adept ſhall be laid before the reader: a very few reflections will then ſuffice to lead us to the fountain head whence ſprung all the mysteries and ſystems of Free-maſonry, and to develop to its full extent the true ſpirit with which it is actuated.

“ In the South of France, ſays our Sophiſticated and Maſonic Adept, whole provinces united to adopt a Doctrine more ſimple, a Chriſtianity more pure, where man, ſubject only to the Deity, judged according to his own lights what the Deity had pleaſed to reveal in the books emanating from him.

“ Fanaticiſed armies, led by ambitious Chiefs, deſtroyed theſe provinces. Executioners led by Legates and Priests immolated thoſe who had eſcaped the fury of the foldiery; a tribunal of Monks was eſta bliſhed, who were to condemn to the flames all that were ſuſpected of hearken ing to the dictates of reaſon.

“ They

“ They nevertheless could not hinder this spirit  
 “ of Liberty and research from gaining ground.  
 “ Overpowered in the state where it had dared to  
 “ appear, and where more than once intolerant  
 “ hypocrisy had combated it with savage war, it  
 “ would reproduce and spread itself in a neigh-  
 “ bouring country. It was to be found at all  
 “ times until that period when, seconded by the  
 “ invention of printing, it grew in power suffi-  
 “ ciently to deliver a great part of Europe from  
 “ the yoke of the Court of Rome.

“ At that time there existed a class of men,  
 “ who, despising all superstitions, were content  
 “ secretly to despise them, or who at most took  
 “ the liberty of making them, now and then, the  
 “ objects of their sarcastic wit; the more stinging  
 “ as they were worded in terms of the utmost  
 “ respect.”

As a proof of this spirit of Philosophism or Impiety at that period, Condorcet cites the Emperor Frederic II. his Chancellor Peter de Vigne, the works entitled *LES TROIS IMPOSTEURS (the three Impostors)*, *LES FABLIAUX* and the *DECAMERONE DI BOCACIO*; it is then that he adds those words already cited in the preceding chapter, but necessary to be repeated, “ We will examine whether  
 “ at a time when Philosophic Profelytism would  
 “ have been attended with danger, *secret associa-*  
 “ *tions were not formed, destined to spread and per-*

"petuate privately and without danger, among a  
 "few adepts, a small number of simple truths as  
 "certain preservatives against the predominant pre-  
 "judices.

"We will examine whether that celebrated  
 "order (the Templars), against which the Popes  
 "and Kings so barbarously conspired, are to be  
 "numbered among these associations \*."

I will avail myself of this indication of Condorcet. Those *men of the South*, among whom he promised to seek the origin of these secret associations, are known. They are that motley crew followers of Manes, who during many ages, spreading from the East into the West, inundated France, Germany, Italy, and Spain at the time of Frederic the Second; they are that horde of sectaries known by the names of *Albigensis, Cathares, Patarins, Bulgares, Begards, Brabanters, Navarrese, Bearnese, Coteraux, Henriciens, Leonists, &c. &c.*; in fine, sectaries who, under a hundred different and uncouth names, recall to the mind of the reader every thing that had been broached by the most direful enemies of morality, government, and the altar, and that had *as yet* appeared in Europe. I have studied their tenets in their divers ramifications. I have viewed that *monstrous whole* of all the *Jehovabs* which Masonry could invent. In

\* Esquisse d'un Tableau, &c. Epoque 7.

their



their twofold principle is to be found the twofold God of the Martinist and Cabalistic Mason. In the diversity of their opinions is to be found the concord of Eclectic Masonry against the God of Christianity. In their principles are to be seen the germ and explanation of the most infamous mysteries of the Occult Lodges, and of their forerunners the Templars. They declare the flesh to have been created by the evil spirit, that they might have the right of prostituting it. All is in the direct line of succession, the Cathares, the Albigeois, the Knights Templars, and our Jacobins of the Occult Lodges, all proceed from the same parental stock. This is still more evident when we consider their disorganizing principles of Liberty and Equality, which declare that no submission is due *to the Spiritual or Temporal powers*.—This was the distinctive mark of the Albigeois; it was by this distinction they were pointed out to the Magistrates as the persons amenable to the laws enacted against the sect. Let us follow them.

At that period when the multitude of their sectaries empowered them, with arms in their hands, to triumph over their opponents, we see them resorting to all the frantic rage of Jacobinized Masonry against the very name of Christian. Even before the spiritual and temporal authorities had united their efforts to subdue their savage rage, they had already exercised all the cruelties and  
fero-

ferocities of a Robespierre: Jacobin like, they went *beating down the churches and the religious houses, massacring without mercy the widow and the fatherless, the aged parent and the infant child, making neither distinction of age nor sex; and, as the sworn enemies of Christianity, ravaged and destroyed every thing both in Church and State\**.

When

\* All this would be amply proved had we published our *Memoirs on Ancient Jacobinism*. In the mean time our readers may consult what remain of the cotemporary writers or who lived soon after, for the opinions and actions of these sectaries. Such for example as Gläber, who witnessed their first appearance at Orleans 1017; Reinier, who was one of their adepts during seventeen years; and Philichdorf, Ebrard, and Hermangard, who lived with them. They may also consult St. Antoninus, Fleuri, Collier, Baronius; but above all let the Councils which condemned these sects be attended to, and their decrees compared with history; and then will vanish many false prejudices imbibed against the means adopted both by church and state for the irradicating of those sectaries, who, truly Jacobins, aimed at the absolute destruction of all civil society, and of Christianity itself. How is it possible to doubt of the tendency of their disorganizing Liberty and Equality, when we know that the proof necessary and pointed out to the Judges for the conviction of these sectaries, consisted in showing that the accused was one of those who held that *no obedience was due to the civil or spiritual powers, and that no authority was entitled to punish any crimes*. Such is precisely the doctrine of the Council of Taragone, to know whether the famous decrees of the third and fourth Councils of Lateran are applicable to the accused—*Qui dicunt potestatibus ecclesiasticis vel secularibus non esse obediendum et penam corporalem non esse*

When at length the public authority had triumphed over these ferocious sectaries, they shrunk back into their dens or Occult Lodges, and reduced

*esse infligendam in aliquo casu et familia* (Concil. Tarag. anno 1242). How then can it be asserted, that the furies of these sectaries were only in reprisal of the Crusade published against them, when we see that the very first decree issued in this crusade was precisely to rid Europe of their rebellious principles, and of the cruelties which they were already exercising in the states of Thoulouse under the title of *Coteraux*, in Biscay under that of *Basques*, and in many other countries under different names, *Brabantionibus, Aragonensibus, Navariis, Bascolis, Coterellis, et Triaverdinis, qui tantam in Christianos immanitatem exercent, ut nec Ecclesiis nec Monasteriis deferant, non viduis non pupillis, non senibus et pueris nec cuilibet parcant etati aut sexui, sed more Paganorum omnia perdant et vastent* (Conc. Lateran. 1179). Such nevertheless is the first motive stated, and the first decree issued of this famous crusade. What have Robespierre and the other Jacobins done more to deserve it?

It is inconceivable how much people have been mistaken both with respect to this decree and to that issued on the same subject by the fourth Œcumenical Council of Lateran, anno 1215. They were represented as the church assuming the power of deposing Sovereigns, as usurping all civil and temporal power. And such is the interpretation given to those very decrees which hindered the Jacobins of those days from executing the very plans which our contemporaries have carried into effect against the altar, the throne, and all civil society! Had I but leisure for digesting the materials I have collected, both the church and her councils would be amply avenged of such a calumny. I hope hereafter to publish a particular dissertation on that subject, and to be able to show  
how

ced themselves again to secret associations. Then they had their oaths, their occult doctrines, their signs and their degrees, as the Occult Masons have their

how strangely those decrees have been misconceived, from a want of knowing the history of those times and of the men against whom they were issued.—Let us suppose for an instant Philip D'Orleans, in virtue of the oath of allegiance common in the Feudal System, summoning all his vassals to follow him and unite with his Jacobins in the destruction of the throne, of the laws, of all society and of religion; will any man of sense believe the vassals to be bound, by their oath, to carry arms under and to follow Philip's standard and thus second his antisocial conspiracy? Is it not evident on the contrary, that no oath can bind subjects to support such a war, that all oaths are null, which can only be fulfilled by the destruction of the throne, the annihilation of the laws, and of the basis of all civil society; that in such a position, it is the cause of the sovereign, of the laws, and of society, that is to be defended in spite of all oaths? Well, I will pledge myself to prove that the famous decrees of the Councils of Lateran against the *Albigensis* were no more than a similar decision, that, so far from encroaching on the authority of Kings, they were issued in their defence, in defence of their persons, of their authority, of the laws, and of civil society; that had it not been for those decrees both sovereignty and the empire of the laws would long since have been at an end.

I should have numerous errors to combat, and one in particular which I shall not forget. I know there are men so much biased in favour of the *Albigensis* and the *Vaudois*, as to represent them as the ancestors of the Anglican Church, in proof of its antiquity. Such were the pretensions of the English Editor of the translation of Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*.

their perfect masters; and their apprentices were only admitted partially to the secrets \*.

In future we may dispense with Condorcet's researches on the secret associations of these famous sectaries. That is not the point to be sought for in their history. We know they had their oaths, their signs, their secret language, their fraternity, their propaganda, and, above all, *secrets which a father could not reveal to his children, nor a child to a parent; secrets which a brother could not mention to his sister, nor the sister to her brother* †.

What is the most remarkable is the coincidence pointed out by Condorcet between the mysteries

History. (*See his notes on the articles Vandois and Albigeois*). Though the cause of the Anglican Church is not my own, still I will serve it better than all those feeble writers.—I will avenge it of the shame of such an origin. I will prove, that, so far from descending from the Vaudois, they openly condemned their disorganizing principles both before and after the reign of Henry VIII. and that there never existed the least connection between it and the Albigeois. It is the exclusive privilege of the Jacobins, and Condorcet's secret associations, to descend from and glory in such progenitors.

• Est valde notandum quod ipse Johannes et Complices sui, non audent revelare prædictos errores credentibus suis, ne ipsi discedant ab eis—Sic tenebant Albanenses, exceptis simplicioribus quibus singula non revelabantur (*Reinier de Cataris Lugduni & Albanenses*.) Such are exactly the secrets of the first and of the Occult Lodges, of the simple dupes and of the consummate adepts.

† Philichdorf, *contra* Waldenses, Chap. 13.

of

of the sectaries, those of the Templars, and those again of the secret associations of our days. We know whence the sectaries of the South sprung ; we know their common father ; if he is to be the progenitor of Freemasonry, the stock is not honourable. To be sure it will trace the *Masonie* mysteries back to the immense space of sixteen centuries, but if this origin be true the adept need not glory in it. History has spoken clearly. The true parent of the *Albigensis*, of the *Cathares*, *Bigards*, *Bulgares*, *Coteraux* and *Patarins*, of all those sects in fine mentioned by Condorcet, is the slave sold to the Palestine widow ; it is the slave *Curbicus*, more generally known under the name of *Manes*. It is not we who have traced the Masonic Lodges and their mysteries to this slave ; it is Condorcet ; he is the person to be blamed by the adepts. We were sorry to reveal so humiliating an origin ; but we only raised the veil pointed at by Condorcet. He had seen that slave, indignant at the fetters which disgraced his youth, seeking to revenge himself on society for the baseness of his origin. He heard him preaching liberty, because he had been born in slavery ; preaching equality, because born in the most degraded class of the human species. Condorcet did not dare say that the first Jacobin Mason was a slave ; but he pointed out the offspring of *Curbicus* in the sectaries of the South, in the order of the

the Templars. He has shown the brethren, who have inherited from these sectaries and the Templars, to be the adepts in Masonry, and that was sufficiently saying that they all sprung from one common parent.

But let us beware of deciding on this single proof. If the mysteries of Masonry really are to be traced back to Manes, if he be the true father, the founder of the Lodges, we are first to prove it by his tenets, and then by the similarity and conformity of their secrets and symbols. We beg the reader's attention to the following comparative statement; the result will not be unimportant to history, and it particularly interests those who are to watch over the welfare of nations.

I. With respect to tenets, till the existence of Eclectic Masonry, that is to say, till the Impious Sophisters of the age introduced into the rites of the Lodges their impious mysteries of Deism and Atheism, no other God, no other *Jehovah* is to be found in the Masonic code but that of Manes or the universal Being, subdivided into the *God Good* and the *God Evil*. It is that of the Cabalistic Masonry, and of the ancient Rosicrucians; it is that of the Martinists, who seem to have only copied Manes and his Albigeois adepts. A most extraordinary fact is, that in an age when the Gods of Superstition were to disappear before the Gods of our modern Sophisters, the God of Manes should have

have preserved his ascendancy in so many branches of Masonry.

II. At all times the follies of the Cabal, and of Magic founded on the distinction of this twofold God, had been received in the Masonic Lodges.—Manes also made magicians of his Elect \*.

III. Manes in particular is the founder of that religious fraternity which the Occult Masons interpret into a total indifference for all religion.—That Heresiarch wished to gain over to his party men of every sect; he preached that they all tended to the same end, and he promised to receive them all with the same affection †.

IV. But above all, what we should particularly attend to, and compare both in the code of Manes and of the Occult Lodges, are the principles of disorganizing Liberty and Equality. That neither Princes nor Kings, superiors nor inferiors might exist, this Heresiarch taught his adepts, that all laws and all magistracy was the work of the evil principle ‡.

V. Left there should be either poor or rich, he inculcated that the whole belonged to all, and that

\* Magorum quoque dogmata Manes novit, et in ipsis voluntatur. (*Centuriatores Magdeburgenses ex Augustino.*)

† V. Baronius in Manetem.

‡ Magistratus civiles et politias damnabant ut quæ a Deo malo conditæ et constitutæ sunt. (*Centuriatores Magdeburgenses, Tom. II- in Manesem.*)



no person had the right of appropriating to himself a field, a house, &c \*.

Such doctrines must naturally have suffered many modifications in the Occult Lodges as well as among the disciples of Manes. He aimed at the abolition of all laws and of Christianity, at the establishment of Liberty and Equality, by means of superstition and fanaticism; our modern Sophisters were to give his systems a new direction, that of their impiety. The Altar and the Throne were equally to be victims to them; and Liberty and Equality, in opposition to Kings and to God, were the last mysteries of Manes, as they are of our modern Sophisters.

VI. The same conformity is to be found between the degrees of the adepts before they are initiated in the profound secrets. The names are changed; but Manes had his *Believers*, his *Elect*, and his *Perfects*. These latter were impeccable, that is to say, absolutely free; because no violation of any law could inculcate them †. These three degrees correspond with those of *Apprentice*, *Fellowcraft*, and *Perfect Master*. The name of *Elect* has been preserved in Masonry, but it constitutes the fourth degree.

\* Nec domos, nec agros, nec pecuniam ullam possidendam. (Ibid. Ex Epiphanio & Augustino.)

† Hieronimus, Præmium Dialogorum contra Pelagium.

VII. The same terrible and inviolable oaths bound the disciples of Manes as bind the adepts of the Occult Lodges, to keep the secrets of their degree. St. Austin had been admitted to the degree of *Believer* nine years, without being initiated into that of *Elect*—"Swear or forswear yourself, " but be true to your secret," was their motto\*.

VIII. The same number and almost identity of signs. The Masons have three which they call the *sign*, the *gripe*, and the *word*. The Manichæans also had three, that of the *word*, of the *gripe*, and of the *breast* †. This latter was suppressed on account of its indecency; it can be traced to the Templars; the other two are still extant in the Lodges of Masonry.

Every Mason who wishes to know whether you *have seen the light*, begins by offering his hand to know whether you are acquainted with the gripe. It was precisely by the same method that the Manichæans recognized each other, and felicitated a brother on having seen the light ‡.

\* Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli. (*Augustinus de Manichæis.*)

† Signa, oris, manuum et sinus. (*Centuriatores Magdeburgenses ex Augustine.*)

‡ Manichæorum alter alteri obviam factus, dexteram dant sibi ipsis signi causa, velut a tenebris servati. (*Ibid. ex Epiphano.*)

IX. If

IX. If we penetrate into the interior of the Masonic Lodges, we shall find representations of the sun, of the moon, and of the stars. These are nothing more than Manes's symbols of his *God Good* whom he brings from the sun, and of the different genii which he distributed in the stars. If the candidate is only admitted into the Lodge blindfold, it is because he is yet in the empire of darkness, whence Manes brings his *God Evil*.

X. I do not know whether any of the Masonic adepts are sufficiently informed of their own genealogy to know the real origin of their decorations, and of the fable on which the explanations of the Occult Degrees are founded. But the following is a striking proof of their descent from Manes. In the degree of Master every thing denotes mourning and sorrow. The Lodge is hung in black, in the middle is a *Sarcophagus* resting on five steps, covered with a pall. Around it the adepts in profound silence mourn the death of a man whose ashes are supposed to lie in this tomb. This man is at first said to be Adoniram, then Molay, whose death is to be avenged by that of all tyrants. The allegory is rather inauspicious to Kings; but it is of too old a date not to be anterior to the Grand Master of the Templars.

The whole of this ceremonial is to be found in the ancient mysteries of the disciples of Manes. This was the ceremony which they called *Bema*.

D d 2

They

They also assembled round a *Sarcophagus* resting on five steps, decorated in the like manner, and rendered great honors to him whose ashes it was supposed to contain. But they were all addressed to Manes. It was his death that they celebrated; and they kept this feast precisely at the period when the Christians celebrated the death and resurrection of Christ\*.

The Christians frequently reproached them with it; and in our days the same reproach is made to the Rosicrucians, of renewing their funeral ceremonies precisely at the same time, that is, on the Thursday in Holy Week †.

XI. In the Masonic games *Mac Benac* are the two words which comprehend the secret meaning of this mystery. The literal signification of these words, we are told by the Masons, is, *the flesh parts from the bone*. This very explication remains a mystery, which only disappears when we reflect on the execution of Manes. This Heresiarch had promised by his prayers to cure the King of Persia's child, on condition that all the doctors were dismissed. The young Prince died and Manes

\* Plerumque Pascha nullum celebrant—Sed Pascha suum, id est diem quo Manichæus occisus, quinque gradibus instructo tribunali, et preciosis linteis adornato, ac in promptu posito, et obiecto adorantibus, magnis honoribus prosequuntur. (*August. contra Epist. Manich.*)

† See Mr. Le Franc's Degree of Rosicrucian.

fled;

fled; but, falling again into the hands of the King, he was flayed alive with the points of reeds \*. Such is the clear explanation of *Mac Benac*, the flesh leaves the bones, *he was flayed alive* †.

XII. The very reeds bear testimony of the fact. People are surprized at seeing the Rosicrucians begin their ceremonies by seating themselves sorrowfully and in silence on the ground, then raising themselves up and walking each with a long reed in his hand ‡. All this is easily explained again, when we reflect that it was precisely in this posture that the Manichæans were used to put themselves, affecting to sit or lay themselves down on mats made of reeds, to perpetuate the memory of the manner in which their master was put to death §. And it was for this reason that they were called *Matarii*.

\* Epiph. Baronius, Fleuri, &c.

† Were it objected, that every thing in this degree appears grounded on the story of Adoniram and Solomon's Temple, I would answer, Yes, as to words; but as to facts nothing relating to the death of Adoniram is to be found in the History of Solomon or of his Temple. All is allegorical, and entirely applicable to Manes. The *Mac Benac* is inapplicable to the Templars. Beside, the whole of this ceremony is far anterior to them. They may have shaped the fable according to their own profession; but they have preserved the leading feature, the *Mac Benac*, which carries us back immediately to Manes.

‡ Mr. Le Franc's Degree of Rosæ Crucis.

§ Centuriatores Mag.leburgenfes, Baronius, &c.

D d 3

Were

Were we to continue our comparative statement we should meet with many other similarities; we should find, for example, that Fraternity so much extolled by the Craft, and which would be deservedly applauded were it not confined solely to their own body. A similar reproach was made to the Manichæans, that they were always ready to succour one of their own sect, but extremely hard on the poor of other descriptions\*.

The same zeal for the propagation of their mysteries is also observable in both. The modern adepts glory in their Lodges being spread all over the world. Such also was the propagating spirit of Manes and of his adepts. Addas, Herman, and Thomas went by his orders to establish his mysteries, the first in Judea, the second in Egypt, and the third in the East, while he himself preached in Persia and Mesopotamia. Beside, he had twelve Apostles, though some say twenty-two; and in a very short space of time we see his doctrines, like the Freemasons, spreading all over the world†.

Attending only to the most striking similarities, we have seen the Occult degrees of Masonry founded on the *Bema* of the Manichæans. It was

\* *Quin et homini mendico, nisi Manichæus sit, panem et aquam non porrigunt. (Augustinus de Moribus Manichæorum et contra Faustinum.)*

† *Centuriatores Magdeburgenses ex Epiphanio.*

Manes

Manes whom they were to avenge on all Kings, on Kings who had condemned him to be flayed alive and who, according to his doctrines, had only been instituted by the evil spirit ; and the word to be recovered was that doctrine itself, to be established on the ruins of Christianity. The Templars, taught by the adepts dispersed throughout Egypt and Palestine, substituted, at their dissolution, their Grand Master Molay for Manes, as the object of their vengeance ; and the spirit of the mysteries and the allegory remained the same. It is always Kings and Christianity that are to be destroyed, Empires and the Altar to be overturned, in order to re-establish the Liberty and Equality of human nature.

The result of these researches are certainly not flattering to the Craft ; it traces the origin of their Lodges and of their doctrines on Liberty and Equality to a slave flayed alive for his impostures. However humiliating such an origin may be, still such must be the result of the researches of him who seeks the source whence all their mysteries are derived. Their Occult secrets are all founded on this man who is to be avenged, and on that word or doctrine which is to be recovered in their third degree. The whole of this third degree is an evident repetition of the *Bema* of the Manichæan degree of *Elef*, the famous Mac Benac is clearly explained by the species of punishment inflicted on Manes, and every thing leads us back to

D d 4

the

the Palestine widow's slave\*. We may defy the Masons to find any ceremony similar to their's of *Mac Benac* either before or since the *Bema* of the Manichæans, if it be not the *Bema* itself; it is to that therefore that we must refer back; it is there we must rest to find the source of the Masonic mysteries.

The silence observed on this origin by the most learned Masons proves that they were ashamed, but not that they were ignorant of it. It must at least have been difficult for them to have so often in the mysteries of the cabal commented on the *Jehovah* of Manes, subdivided like their own, into the *Good* and *Evil* principle, without knowing the grand author of this system, and who has given his name to the sect of the twofold God; without recognizing him, otherwise so famous as a profound adept in all the mysteries of the cabal, or of magic and astrology.

\* Will not this circumstance of the Widow explain a custom with the Masons, who, when they find themselves exposed to any danger, and that they have hopes of being heard by any of the brethren, in order to make themselves known and to obtain succour they hold their hands on their heads and call out, *help from the children of the widow*? If the modern Masons are ignorant of the fact, the ancient adepts were well acquainted with it; and all history asserts that Manes was adopted by the widow to whom Budda, Scythian's disciple, fled for refuge, and that the Heresiarch inherited all the riches he had left her. *Help from the children of the widow*, therefore naturally alludes to the children of Manes,

It



It could hardly be possible for the Hero of the Martinists not to have seen that his Apocalypse was nothing but the Heresiarch's code. It cannot be supposed that Condorcet, tracing the origin of the secret associations, and bringing the Templars so near to the *Albigensis*, could have been ignorant of what all history asserts, that the *Albigensis* and all the ramifications of those sects of the South (the *Vaudois* excepted) were really no other than Manichæans; beside, that all those infamous proceedings of the Templars had long since been attributed to the children of Manes; and that all those horrors are easily explained by his doctrines.

When we see the principal adepts of Masonry, such as Lalande, Dupuis, Le Blond, De Launaye, seeking to substitute the errors of the Manichæans and of the Persians, to the mysteries of the Christian religion, it is still more difficult to believe that they had not furnished the real author of their mysteries\*.

It may be possible that the History of the Templars and of their Grand Master, as more interesting to the adepts, may have obliterated the remembrance of so humiliating an origin.

The object of our researches has not been to humble the Masonic body, but to develop the

\* See Remarks on the general and particular History of Religion, by Mr. Le Franc.

snare of a sect justly branded with infamy from the very first days of its existence. Our object is particularly to make men sensible at length how much it interests both religion and the state to investigate the grand object of a secret association spread throughout the universe, an association whose secret is beyond a doubt contained in those two words *Liberty and Equality*, confided to the adepts in the very first degrees of Masonry; of an association whose last mysteries are no more than the explanation of these words to the full extent which the Jacobinical Revolution has given to them.

The hatred which a slave had conceived for his bonds makes him invent the words *Liberty and Equality*. The detestation of the condition in which he was born makes him believe that the evil spirit alone could have been the Creator of those Empires which contain Masters and Servants, Kings and Subjects, Magistrates and Citizens. He declares Empires to be the work of the Evil spirit, and he binds his disciples by an oath to destroy them. He at the same time inherits the books and all the absurdities of a Pagan Philosopher, a great Astrologer and Magician, and composes his code, a monstrous digest of these absurdities, and of the hatred he had conceived against the distinctions and laws of society. He creates mysteries, distributes his adepts into different classes or degrees

grees and establishes his sect. Though justly punished for his impostures, he leaves them his execution as a new motive to stimulate their hatred against Kings. This sect spreads itself from the East to the West, and by means of its mysteries perpetuates and propagates itself. It is to be met with in every age. Crushed a first time in Italy, France, and Spain, it spreads anew from the East in the eleventh century. The Knights Templars adopt its mysteries, and the dissolution of that order lends a pretence to new-model their games. The hatred of Kings and of the God of the Christians is only stimulated by these new motives. The times and manner of the age may vary the forms or modify the opinions, but the essence remains; it is always the pretended light of Liberty and Equality to be diffused; it is the Empire of pretended Tyrants, whether religious or political, of Pontiffs, of Priests, of Kings, of Christ himself, which are to be destroyed, in order to re-establish the people in that twofold Equality and twofold Liberty, which proscribes the religion of Christ and the authority of Kings. The degrees and mysteries are multiplied and precautions are redoubled lest they should be betrayed; but their last oath is always hatred to the God who died on the Cross,—hatred to the Monarch seated on the Throne,

Such

Such is the historical sketch of Masonry, and the main point of its secrets. Let the reader compare the proofs we have adduced from the very nature of its degrees, the proofs taken from the dissertations of the most learned adepts of the most zealous Masons on their mysteries; all those, in fine, which we have drawn from their various opinions on the origin of their association; and I do not think he can entertain any doubt as to the grand object of this institution. Let him then reflect on the manner in which we were led back by Condorcet from the Masons of the day to the slave Curbicus, and how we discover in this Heresiarch and his adepts the real authors of the code and mysteries of Freemasonry; and I do not apprehend that he can any longer entertain a doubt as to their first and real progenitors.

Still it remains for us to show how these same mysteries promoted the plans of the Sophisters of Impiety united with those of Rebellion, in the execution of their plots for effecting the grand Revolution. But let us not terminate this chapter without repeating our protestations in favor of the immense number of Masons who have never been initiated in the Occult Mysteries of the sect. Let us admire the wisdom of English Masonry in rejecting all those degrees where an explanation of the mysteries begins to develop their dangerous principles. Let us admire and applaud them for  
having

having transformed this conspiring sect of other states into an association evidently useful to their own. The more strongly we have insisted on the importance to all Empires of investigating the dangerous principles of the Occult Lodges, the better pleased and the more ready we are to do justice to those whom we have seen so generally adopting the principles of a benevolent Equality, and of a Liberty secured by subjection to the laws.

---

CHAP.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Sixth Degree of the Conspiracy against Kings.**Coalition of the Sophisters and of the Freemasons.*

THE generality of Freemasons of the present day do the Scotch the honour of looking upon their Grand Lodge as the stock whence all the others sprang: It is there, they tell us, that the Templars convened for the preservation of their mysteries: it is thence that they suppose Masonry spread through England into France, Germany, and other states. This is not an improbable conjecture with respect to the actual form\*, and present

\* I say with respect to the *actual form of their Lodges*, and not as to the substance of their mysteries; for there had existed Freemasons long since in England who pretended neither to descend from the Knights Templars nor the Grand Lodge in Scotland. This is to be seen in a manuscript written two hundred and sixty years ago and still preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. This manuscript is a copy of certain questions written about a hundred years before by Henry VI. in his own hand. The date then of the original is about three hundred and thirty years back, as Henry VI. departed this life in 1471. (*See Mr. Locke's Letter and this Manuscript in W. Preston's Illustrations of Masonry, Book III. Sect. 1.*)

There

sent aspect of their mysteries, but, from whatever part they may have spread throughout Europe, it is an undoubted fact, that Lodges existed in  
France

There are two important remarks to be made on this manuscript. First, that the adept questioned on the origin of Masonry makes no mention of the Templars; on the contrary he says, that all the important secrets of which it is in possession were brought into Europe by Venetian merchants coming from the East. (*Comeð ffyrste ffromme the este ynn Venetia—3d answer.*) Locke suspects that in those times of monkish ignorance, the Masons might have mistaken the Venetians for the Phenicians. Mr. Locke could not have chosen a more unfavourable moment for his suspicion, as the Masons and even the Monks had by means of the crusades learned to distinguish between the Phenicians and Venetians, and particularly between Tyr and Venice—Nothing was more natural than the answer made by the Mason to Henry VI. ‘That the mysteries had been brought from the East by the Venetians.’ All Masons agree that the Templars learned them in the East. It is very natural that the Venetians, so famous in those days for their commerce in the East, should have taken these mysteries whence the Templars afterwards did, and whose history had not yet been incorporated with that of Freemasonry. But the reader will remark, that every thing leads us back to Manes, to the countries whence, it is well known, the sect and its mysteries spread into Europe.

The second observation to be made on this ancient Manuscript is, that even in England Freemasonry already comprehended all those systems of Cabal, of Astrology, and of Divination, sciences all founded on the twofold principle of Manes. The art of living *without fear or hope* is also to be remarked, the grand object of Manes, as well as of all impious wretches;  
the

France and in most other states in the beginning of this century.

First obstacles to the propagation of Masonry.

In 1735 they were proscribed by an edict of the States of Holland; two years later they were prohibited in France by Lewis XV.; and in 1738, Clement the XII. published his famous Bull of excommunication against them, afterwards renewed by Benedict XIV. In 1748, they were proscribed in Switzerland by the Council of Berne.

From the very nature of their mysteries, this association could long resist the storms by which it was assailed. Men trained to the art of hiding themselves had no other precautions to take than to avoid the publicity of large assemblies. It was in the very nature of their tenets that they found the greatest obstacles to their propagation. England, it is true, disgusted with a Liberty and Equality which the civil feuds of its Lollards, Ana-

the art of making perfection and true liberty consist in disbelieving a future state, which may constitute the hopes of the just man and the terror of the wicked. And this is confounded in the general terms of the Manuscript—*The art of wonderwerckynge, and of foresayinge thynges to come—the skille of becommynge gude and parfyghte wythouten the holpynges of FERE or HOPE* (8th answer). Amidst all the panegyrics bestowed on Masonry in this ancient record such are the documents contained in it. Though so much extolled by Masons, the reader will certainly not receive it as a proof of the pretended innocence of their mysteries.

baptists,



baptists, and Presbyterians had taught it to appreciate, had rejected from its Masonic games all explanations tending to the overthrow of Governments; but it did not clear itself of all the adepts who still remained attached to the disorganizing principles of the ancient mysteries. It was this species of adept that preserved the greatest zeal for the propagation of its tenets; it was some of these who, wishing to attract Voltaire into their party, had made Thiriot write, that notwithstanding the title of *Liberty and Equality* given to his Letters, he did not go to the point.

Unfortunately for France and for the rest of Europe, such was the species of adepts which took the lead in the propagation of their mysteries—*at first their progress was slow and imperceptible.*—It had cost Voltaire much to adopt their disorganizing principles, and it would necessarily cost many young men much more, who, not having stifled all sentiments of religion, repressed not only that spirit of independence but even that of curiosity and the desire of knowing a secret only to be acquired by an oath which might be perjury in itself.

In France particularly it must have been difficult to inculcate mysteries, whose last secret was apostasy and rebellion, in men as yet unaccustomed to declamations against Sovereigns and the social order. Policy at first, and afterwards the progress

of the Sophisters, removed every difficulty. The Freemasons, according to custom, sought to gain an ascendancy over the mind of some man who might protect them against and avert the indignation of the Sovereign; and with the apron they request the Prince Conti to accept the title of Grand Master of the French Lodges. The Prince consented to be initiated, and on that occasion the construction was put upon the mysteries which is artfully given whenever a candidate is received, whose sentiments, rank, or grandeur, is known to militate against the disorganizing principles of Liberty and Equality. Many Princes and some Sovereigns fell into a similar error. The Emperor Francis I. would also be initiated; and he protected the brethren, who never revealed any secret to him which could shock his known piety. Frederic II. was also a Freemason. The adepts told him all their secrets against Christ, but guarded against the most distant hint of applying Liberty and Equality to the rights of the throne, which he was so jealous of maintaining.'

In fine, the policy of the craft went so far as to gain protectors even among the Princesses by initiating them in the lesser mysteries. Maria Charlotte, at present Queen of Naples, believed, without doubt, that she was only protecting most faithful subjects; she petitioned in favour of the proscribed brethren, who were even in danger of suffering.

fering. A medal struck on the occasion, her health drank with that of the Grand Master at the Masonic feasts, appeared to be an infallible pledge of the gratitude of the Craft : and under her auspices they spread far and near. But when the Conspiracy burst forth at Naples this protected brotherhood were found to be a nest of conspiring Jacobins. The plot had been contrived in their Lodges, and the protecting Queen stood foremost on the list of proscriptions.

Many Lords and Noblemen, true and accepted Masons, had joined in the conspiracy ; but the Court soon discovered the *occult* plot, in which it had been decided that all the Nobles, though Jacobin Masons, should be massacred immediately after the Royal Family by the equal and clouted-shoed brethren.

In animadverting on these facts, of which the Historians of the Revolution will have to treat hereafter, my design is to draw the attention of my reader to that policy of which so many great personages have been the miserable dupes. The Occult Masons would go in quest of them, and initiate them in all the mysteries against religion.— The initiation of these Noblemen quieted the fears and averted the attention of Government from the Lodges, seeing them frequented by men who were the natural allies of the throne. And this policy of the Occult Lodges proved one of the most suc-

E c 2

cessful

cessful tools for their success. The names of the most faithful servants of the crown screened the rebellious plots of their occult mysteries; and that of *Conti* easily quieted Lewis XV. with respect to the Masons. The Police of Paris made no farther enquiries, and the Lodges were tolerated. The Sophisters and the progress of Impiety furnished them with new and more efficacious means of multiplying their Lodges.

According as Voltaire and Holbach's club succeeded in inundating Europe with their impious writings, the Craft extended its conquests. It was then easy for the Philosophists to make themselves be listened to by men already disposed to the secret mysteries by their Antichristian and Antimonarchical publications, and to inspire them with a desire of a new order of things to be learned in their Lodges. Curiosity, stimulated by impiety, daily made new converts to the sect. Impiety continued propagated and spread wide the spirit and fashion of Masonry, and that was the great service rendered to it by the Sophisters of the age.

On their side, the Sophisters of Impiety and Rebellion soon perceived the connection between the mysteries of Masonry and their Philosophism. They were desirous of being acquainted with those mysteries whose profound adepts were their most zealous disciples; and soon all the French Philosophists became Masons. Many years before the  
Revo-

Revolution, it was difficult to meet with a Sophister who was not a Freemason. Voltaire alone had not been initiated. The Craft had too great obligations to him; it was indebted to him for too many of their adepts, not to testify their gratitude to him. Scarcely had this octogenary infidel arrived at Paris when they prepared the most pompous *fête* for his admission to the mysteries. At eighty years of age he was *admitted to the light*. After having taken the oath, the secret which flattered him the most to learn was, that the adepts, in future his brethren, had long since been his most zealous disciples. That their secret consisted in that *Liberty and Equality* which he had himself opposed to the Gospel of his God and to the pretended Tyrants of the Earth. The Lodge resounded with such applause, the adepts rendered him such honours, and he so perfectly felt the cause of them, that, thinking his pride gratified and his vow of hatred accomplished, he blasphemously exclaimed, *This triumph is well worth that of the Nazareen*. The sacred formula of the mysteries was so dear to him, that the ancient adept Franklin, having meanly presented him with his children to bless, he only pronounced over them the words *Equality and Liberty* \*.

\* See the life of Voltaire.

If, after all the proofs we have given of the meaning attached to those words by the profound adepts, any one should doubt of their application to Christ and the throne, let him reflect on the interpretation of them given by Voltaire to the Genevese; and particularly what extent he gave them on his admission among the brethren of *Liberty and Equality*: let him be carried back to this initiation, let him behold the crowned adept, those who crown him, and those who surround him, and can any other proof be required of the object of their mysteries than the list of these attendant brethren. There on the same line he would behold Sophisters and Masons, and particularly those who by their writings have prepared the downfall of the Altar and the Throne, who by their votes have decreed it, and by their crimes have consummated so iniquitous an undertaking. There he would meet the impious brethren, such as Voltaire, Condorcet, Lalande, Dupuis, Bonneville, Volney, and all the other blasphemers both modern and ancient; there again would he see the rebellious brethren, a Fauchet, Bailly, Guillotin, La Fayette, Menou, Chapellier, Mirabeau, and Syeyes; there in the same Lodge he would find the adepts of Holbach's club, and those of *Philip L'Egalité*. Whence this concord, what object can unite so many *impious* brethren, so many *rebellious* brethren in the same Lodge, if not the identity of their secret mysteries?

ries? and why this concourse of the Sophisters to the Masonic Lodges, if not for the mutual succour they are to afford each other?

It was not sufficient for the heroes of the Encyclopedia to unite under their standards against Christ the infidels of the court and of every class. Many in all classes who had remained faithful to their God were also true to their King. Even in the impious part of the Aristocracy many men were to be found, whom fortune, ambition, or custom attached either to the person or to the existence of the Monarch. There existed a public force, which the duty or interest of its chiefs might oppose to their machinations; and a multitude of Citizens might have risen against the Conspirators.

But however numerous the disciples of impiety may have been, still the multitude sided with the altar and the throne. The Sophisters saw they had not as yet sufficiently triumphed over the public opinion; they felt that it was necessary to acquire strength.

Having long meditated on the arts of rebellion, they soon perceived what advantages might be drawn hereafter from the Masonic Lodges. From the period of their coalition a revolution was made in the French Masonry, the adepts of which soon became the children of the Encyclopedia. The Martinists alone, with some few Cabalistic

E c 4

Lodges,

Lodges, remained true to their slave Curbicus; all others adopt the impiety of Voltaire. The real source of the mysteries was to be traced by the forms preserved; but it was at this period that all those novelties were introduced which make it more difficult to trace them. It was on this coalition that all our Duallist Masons were transformed into Atheists, Deists, or Pantheists. It was then that the degrees of *the Knights of the Sun and of the Druids* were added to the former ones; but they are nothing more than the impious degrees of modern Sophistry.

Be they however children of Manes, or the offspring of the Encyclopedia, it was always the same hatred against the altar and the throne, the same conspiracy which constituted the grand object of the Occult Lodges. To secure the triumph of Holbach's club, the Sophisters had only to assure themselves of the support of the pikes\*; and by means of the interior intercourse of the Masonic Lodges they hoped to effectuate it. At the head of this correspondence was a general office called the *Grand Orient*, apparently under

\* I hope the reader will remark here, that the swearing in of the multitude is the last step of a conspiracy, and not the first, as some (little versed in these black arts) are perpetually repeating; and that as long as the authors remain undiscovered, it is but of little avail to discover the vulgar and often mislead agents. T.

the



the direction of the Grand Master, but really conducted by the most profound adepts. This was the seat of Government, the high tribunal where all the Masonic differences or suits were settled; it was also the supreme council whose orders could not be violated or disobeyed without incurring the penalties of perjury.

It was to this tribunal that the different Lodges spread throughout the country sent their deputies, who, residing there, were entrusted with the forwarding of orders, and with notifying their execution. Every Lodge had its president called the *Venerable*, whose duty consisted in forwarding the orders of the *Grand Orient*, or in preparing the brethren for the orders they were to receive. All instructions were transmitted in a secret language, in a particular cypher, or by private means. Lest any false brother or Mason, not subject to the inspection of the *Grand Orient*, should intermix with the real adepts without being discovered, there was a watch-word which changed every quarter, and was regularly sent by the *Grand Orient* to every Lodge under its inspection.

Every branch of this government was bound by the oaths of not revealing to the profane the secrets of Freemasonry. Each Lodge sent its contributions quarterly for the maintenance of the central office, and to cover all expences which this office judged necessary to be incurred for the general

neral interest of the craft. Those Lodges that were not under the inspection of the *Grand Orient*, were under a similar government of a Mother Lodge, which also had its Grand Master and kept the same sort of correspondence.

This part of their constitutions was generally known to all the brethren ; but I have often repeated that with respect to the Occult Lodges they were in the dark. The day was to come when the greatest novice in the art was to show as much zeal as the most profound adept. To effectuate this, it was only necessary to fill their ordinary Lodges with hair-brained young fellows, ignorant citizens, and even thick-headed workmen, who had been previously misled by the impious doctrines of the Sophisters, and with all those who were carried away by that torrent of declamation, calumnies, &c. directed against the altar, the throne, and all the higher orders of society.

With such a species of brethren the Occult Mysteries were unnecessary, and without any further instructions the warhoop of Liberty and Equality was more than sufficient to excite their enthusiasm and direct their blows. A chief in each Lodge, or a very few adepts in direct correspondence with the central office of the Conspirators, might easily be informed of the day and hour on which it was necessary that the minds of these underling adepts should be worked up to revolutionary

tionary fury, and to point out the objects and persons on whom they were to vent their rage. Nor was it impossible to organize those bands of *Brigands* and firebrands into Lodges, and thus distribute to each the different parts of levelling butchers and of revolutionary executioners. These Lodges, multiplied throughout the state in the towns and villages, might, under the direction of the central office or committee, turn out at the same instant all over the country, thousands and tens of thousands of adepts all enthusiastically arrayed under the banners of Liberty and Equality, armed with pikes, hatchets, and torches, carrying fire and desolation wherever their course was traced, knowing beforehand what victims were to be sacrificed, what castles and country houses to be burnt, and what heads to be carried before the triumphant levellers of Liberty and Equality ; thus preserving the most exact accord in the midst of rebellion, levelling at one blow all public force, all public justice, disorganizing every thing and throwing every thing into confusion. But, in order to establish its new empire and organize its own power, it only had to transform its secret dens of conspiracy into Jacobin clubs, and its grand adepts into municipal officers. Thus at length, it gave birth to a Revolution irresistible, consummated, and irreparable even in the first hours of its existence,

ence, and before any one had thought of measures to oppose it.

In thus describing what might have been done by means of that tenebrous secrecy of the Masonic government and Lodges, I have only anticipated what really was done by the Sophisters to effectuate the French Revolution. As early as the year 1776 the central Committee of the *Grand Orient* instructed the directing adepts to prepare the Brethren for insurrection, and to visit the Lodges throughout France, to conjure them by the Masonic oath, and to announce that the time was at length come to accomplish *it* in the death of tyrants.

Deputies  
sent from  
the  
*Grand  
Orient.*

The adept who was intrusted with the visitation of the Northern provinces was an officer of artillery called Sinetty. His Revolutionary Apostleship led him to Lille. The regiment of La Sarre was at that time in garrison there. The Conspirators wished particularly to gain proselytes among and make sure of the military brethren; Sinetty was far from succeeding according to his wishes; but the method and plans he adopted are all that can be necessary for our object. To explain this matter to our readers, we will lay before them the relation made by one of the officers of La Sarre, an eye-witness, and one of the many whom Sinetty had chosen to be present at the meeting  
where

where he was to disclose the object of his Apostleship.

“ We had,” said this worthy officer to me,  
“ our Lodge. It was to us, as to most other regiments, a mere plaything. The trials to which  
“ the new candidates were subjected afforded us  
“ much amusement. The Masonic feasts made us  
“ spend our leisure hours agreeably, and refreshed  
“ us from our labors. You very well understand  
“ that our *Liberty and Equality* was not that of the  
“ Jacobins. The greatest part and nearly the  
“ whole of the officers gave proofs of this at the  
“ Revolution. We indeed little thought of any such  
“ Revolution when an officer of artillery called  
“ Sinetty, a famous Mason, presented himself at  
“ our Lodge. He was received as a brother. At  
“ first he did not appear particular. A few days  
“ after he invited about twenty of us to meet him  
“ at a tea-garden called the Bonne Aventure, a  
“ little out of Lille. We thought he wished to  
“ return the compliment of the feast we had given  
“ him, and expected a common Masonic repast,  
“ when on a sudden he holds forth, declaring he  
“ had important secrets to communicate from the  
“ *Grand Orient*. We listen to him; but judge of  
“ our surprise when we heard him in the most  
“ emphatic and enthusiastic tone declare, ‘ That  
“ at length the time was come, that the plans so  
“ ably conceived and so long meditated by the  
“ true

“ true Masons were on the eve of being accom-  
 “ plished ; that the universe would be freed from  
 “ its fetters ; Tyrants called Kings would be van-  
 “ quished ; religious superstitions would give way  
 “ to light ; Liberty and Equality would succeed  
 “ to the slavery under which the world was op-  
 “ pressed ; and that man would at length be *re-*  
 “ *instated in his rights.*’

“ While our orator continued these declama-  
 “ tions we stared at each other, as much as to  
 “ say, ‘ What is this madman about ?’ We hear-  
 “ kened to him for a whole hour, and silently ;  
 “ meaning afterwards to joke among ourselves.  
 “ What appeared to us the most extravagant was  
 “ the confident manner in which he asserted, that  
 “ it would be vain in future for Tyrants or Kings  
 “ to pretend to oppose their vast plans ; that the  
 “ Revolution was infallible and near ; and that  
 “ the altar and the throne would be overturned \*.

“ He soon perceived that we were not Masons  
 “ of his stamp, and left us to go and visit other

\* Nothing perhaps can show the danger and impolicy of  
 oaths of secrecy more than this passage : For, any rebel, pro-  
 vided he be bound by the same oath, may come and make  
 propositions to you of the most dangerous tendency ; and if,  
 through weakness or depravity, they are hearkened to, he  
 finds Conspirators ready made ; if rejected, they are still kept  
 secret by those who are supposed to be bound to secrecy, for-  
 getting that in this case by the very act they become perjured  
 to their oath of allegiance and to their God. T.

“ Lodges.

“ Lodges. After having laughed for some time  
“ at what we conceived to be the conceits of a  
“ heated brain, we forgot the scene till the Re-  
“ volution (which convinced us but too forcibly  
“ how much we had misconceived the man) re-  
“ called it to our minds.”

When I had determined on publishing this fact, I knew how necessary it would be to authenticate it by the signature of him to whom we are indebted for the above account; but it may easily be conceived that he did not wish to have been looked upon as having betrayed the secrets of the Lodge. Fortunately there are now in London many who were present at that meeting; for example, the Comte de Martange, Mr. de Bertrix, Mr. Le Chev<sup>r</sup> de Myon, all formerly officers in the regiment of La Sarre. Though I have not the honor of their acquaintance, and that they may be a little surprised at seeing themselves named here, still I am not afraid of being contradicted by them, either as to the mission or the manner in which Sinetty fulfilled it; and especially when I add that it was their attachment to their King which misled them with respect to this designing madman. So far were they from any revolutionary ideas, so well did they know the dispositions of the French officers, and so firmly did they think the authority of the King established, that they believed this Sinetty to be a madman, and all his message from  
the

the Master Lodge to be no more than the reveries of a heated brain. Now, that the Revolution has dissipated the illusion, I leave the historian and the reader to meditate on so important a fact. The consequences flow of themselves. They manifest all that the brethren, either Sophisters or *Masons*, coalesced in their central committee, expected from the chosen adepts which they had sent into the provinces to prepare the insurrection. But it was reserved to Syeyes and Condorcet to establish in the very centre of Freemasonry an Apostleship much more general, whose object was to Jacobinize not the Lodges only but the whole Universe.

Establish-  
ment of  
the Ma-  
sonic Pro-  
paganda.

That Condorcet, whom we have observed so jealous of fraternizing with the *Albigensis*, *Patarins*, or *Catares*, in short, with all the Jacobins of the middle age, had, without doubt, studied their means. What history relates of them, to inflame the indignation of the reader, is exactly what he adopted and imitated of their abominable artifices; and he even surpassed them \*. That zeal so common

\* Notwithstanding I have already given various proofs of the coincidence between the modern Jacobins and those of the middle ages, I think it proper to lay before my reader an historical fragment very precious, though little known. It is a letter written in 1243, by one Yvon of Narbonne to Gerald Archbishop of Bourdeaux, and preserved by Matthew Paris, a cotemporary author. In this letter Yvon says, that, accused of leaning towards the Errors of the *Patarins*, he thought it prudent



mon to the adepts did not appear active and ardent enough for him. He joined with Syeyes to found in Masonry itself a true Apostleship of Jacobinism.  
The

prudent to seek safety in flight. Arrived at Come, in Italy, he meets with some *Patarins*, and declares himself to be persecuted for professing their doctrines. He is received as a brother, sumptuously treated, and entrusted with information, of which he gives the following account:

“ For three months,” says he, “ I was among them, well fed, splendidly and voluptuously feasted; learning each day some new error or rather horror against faith, to all which I pretended to assent. *By dint of good treatment they obliged me to promise, that in future, whenever I was in company with Christians, I would do my utmost to prove that the faith of Peter never saved any body. As soon as they had wrested from me this oath, they began to discover their secrets to me. They told me, among other things, that from several towns in Tuscany and from almost all the towns in Lombardy, they carefully sent some of their most docile disciples to Paris, who were there to apply to all the subtilties of Logic and intricate questions of Divinity, in order to prepare them for maintaining their own errors and combating the Apostolic Faith. That beside this they had a great number of merchants whom they sent to the different fairs with a view of perverting the richer laity, and in a word all those with whom they conversed or associated at table. Thus by the extent of their commerce they on one hand enrich themselves by other men’s money, and on the other pervert souls.*”

This, beyond a doubt, is a secret society, a perfect Propaganda. When we reflect that this society was entirely composed of Manichæans, teaching that all men were free and

VOL. II,

F f

equal,

The Lodge established at Paris, Rue Coq-heron, and presided over by the Duke de la Rochefoucault, was more particularly frequented by the profound Masons. After the *Grand Orient*, this was the Lodge wherein the deepest plots were contrived, where Syeyes and Condorcet, with the most zealous of the brethren, held their meetings. This was also the hotbed whence sprung the Propaganda. Of all the writers who have treated of this establishment, none were better acquainted with it than Mr. Girtanner, who lived at Paris in

equal, and were to obey neither *the spiritual nor temporal power*, one can hardly view them in any other light than as Jacobin Masons. Still less can we mistake them when we observe the new adept travelling from Come to Milan, to Cremona, to Venice, and even to Vienna, always received and feasted by the brethren, only making himself known and getting himself acknowledged by means of certain signs which were always secretly given to him, *Semper in recessu accepi ab aliis ad alios inter signa.* (*Matb. Paris Hist. Ang. ann. 1243*).

It is true, that this is a letter written by a penitent adept, who is sorry for having swerved from the true faith, lamenting the horrors he had been guilty of with the other brethren, and only consoling himself with the happy recollection of having reclaimed several from their errors, and craving pardon and penance for his past wickedness. But these circumstances all become new proofs of his sincerity, and only depict in stronger colours the connection between the secret associations of the children of Manes, the true Jacobins of the middle age, and the secret associations of the Occult Masons, or of our modern Jacobins."

the

the midst of the Sophisters and Masons. He afterwards lived with the Jacobins, and pryed into every thing with the eye of a correct observer. A learned Foreigner and a Physician were qualities which rendered him less suspicious, and he was much in their confidence. What we are about to lay before our readers concerning the Propaganda is nearly all extracted from his Memoirs on the French Revolution.

“ The Club of the Propagandists is widely different from that of the Jacobins, though both frequently unite. That of the Jacobins is the grand mover of the National Assembly; that of the Propaganda aims at nothing less than being the mover of all human nature. This latter was in existence as early as the year 1786. The Chiefs are the Duc de la Rochefoucault, Condorcet, and Syeyes.”

For the honour of this unfortunate Duke, we hasten to say, that the Revolutions soon reclaimed him from his errors. He had made himself Grand Master of several Lodges, and was the tool of Syeyes and Condorcet, who made use of his riches to forward their plans. When he beheld the disorganization of France succeeding to the first Constitutionalists, his zeal for the Propaganda was greatly abated. He at length abandoned it, and Condorcet and Syeyes remained the sole Chiefs.

F f 2

“ The

"The grand object of the Propagandist's Club,"  
 says Girtanner, "is, to establish a philosophical  
 "order of things, paramount to all the received  
 "opinions of human nature. To be admitted  
 "into this society it is necessary to be a stickler  
 "for the Modern Philosophy, that is to say,  
 "Dogmatic Atheism; or else to be ambitious, or  
 "discontent with the present Government. The  
 "first requisite on your initiation is, a promise of  
 "the most profound secrecy. The candidate is  
 "then informed, that the number of adepts is  
 "immense, and that they are spread all over the  
 "world. That all are perpetually in quest of false  
 "brethren to make away with them, and to re-  
 "venge themselves on any who should betray  
 "their secret. The candidate then promises to  
 "keep no secret from the brethren, but always to  
 "defend the people against the Government; to  
 "oppose all arbitrary orders, and to do all in his  
 "power to introduce a general toleration of reli-  
 "gions.

"This association is composed of two sorts of  
 "members, those who pay and those who do not.  
 "The first class subscribe at least three Louis a  
 "year, and the rich double the sum. The sub-  
 "scribers are about five thousand; all the rest  
 "engage to propagate the principles of the so-  
 "ciety, and to act according to its views. These  
 "latter may be fifty thousand.

"In

“ In 1790, the general fund of the order  
 “ amounted to twenty millions of livres (900,000l.)  
 “ in specie; and according to statements made,  
 “ there were to be ten millions more before the  
 “ end of 1791.

“ They have two degrees, that of *candidate* and  
 “ that of *initiated*. Their whole doctrine rests on  
 “ the following basis, *want and opinion are the two*  
 “ *agents which make all men act. Cause the want,*  
 “ *govern opinions,* and you will overturn all the  
 “ existing systems; however well consolidated they  
 “ may appear.

“ They will also add, it is impossible to deny  
 “ that the oppression under which men live is  
 “ most frightfully barbarous. It is incumbent on  
 “ the lights of philosophy to quicken the minds  
 “ of men, and to spread the alarm against oppres-  
 “ sors. That once done, it will need only to wait  
 “ the favorable moment when all minds will be  
 “ disposed to embrace the new systems, which  
 “ must be preached throughout all Europe at the  
 “ same time. If any opponents obstruct the way,  
 “ let them be gained by *conviction* or by *want*. If  
 “ they persist in their opposition, treat them like  
 “ Jews, and refuse them every where the rights  
 “ of Citizens.”

A very curious article in their code, and which  
 should not be overlooked (as being probably sug-  
 gested by the little success they obtained at the

outset), is that which instructs the brethren not to try their plan until they are certain of having *created want*. It also says, that it would be better to defer the scheme for fifty years than fail in it through too much precipitation.

“ The Propaganda found much difficulty in  
 “ gaining footing in Holland ; and it only suc-  
 “ ceeded at last by persuading the people there  
 “ that they must be led away by the general tor-  
 “ rent.—At present it draws large sums of money  
 “ from all those provinces for the general fund \*.”

Such is the account given by Mr. Girtanner as early as the month of February 1791. A letter, dated Paris, September 1, 1792, confirms them all, saying, “ You may rest assured, that all that  
 “ I wrote to you concerning the Propaganda is  
 “ perfectly exact. At most there are but a few  
 “ slight errors in the figures, as in the round num-  
 “ bers, which must be taken as approximations.  
 “ *The Propaganda is at present in full activity*. You  
 “ WILL SOON PERCEIVE ITS EFFECTS.”

At the very period when Mr. Girtanner was writing this, it is easy to perceive to what extent they flattered themselves with success. The orator of the club established at Bruxelles under the name of THE FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE had already exclaimed :

\* See Girtanner, Vol. III. in German, from page 470 to 474.

“ Every

“ Every where fetters are forged for the people ; but Philosophy and Reason shall have their turn ; and the day shall come when the Supreme and Sovereign Lord of the Ottoman Empire shall lie down to rest a Despot, and find himself on waking a simple Citizen \*.”

As

\* Ibid.—It is worthy the attention of every Englishman, that the work on the Rights of Man, which appeared under the name of Thomas Paine, was published as early as the year 1791 ; that it was profusely spread all over Great Britain and Ireland (in the latter of which places it may be said to have been the forerunner of the unhappy broils we have since witnessed), and it was sold (as I am credibly informed) as low as for 3d. or 4d. to the Irish Peasantry. We should swell this note to a volume were we to enumerate the miserable or rather the abominable penny publications that prove the almost *licentious* liberty of the press, and that have been and continue to be sold of late. Even Newspapers have taken up the task. The GAZETTER at this moment comes to hand (Saturday the 16th September 1797), in the third page and fourth column, &c. of which) I read in large letters, “ We live in an age pregnant with the seeds of destruction to one class of men, and with the means of triumph to another. The energies of men are all actuated, they are embattled against ERROR and Superstition, along with its hideous train of Mitres, Cardinals, and Sceptres is DESTINED TO VANISH, overwhelmed and exploded by the intrepid reasonings of all good, virtuous, independent friends.” The writer then talks of *Scourges of Industry* and of friends of man ; but, alluding to the French Revolution of the 4th of September, he continues : These “ events will be found to be highly conducive to the promotion and the final success of those schemes which have

F f 4

“ been

As a corroborative proof, let the reader recall to his mind what I said concerning that adept who was for a long time an unheeding Mason; was only initiated in the last mysteries when, on his reception to the degree of *Kadosch*, he was judged a proper person to be admitted into the Propaganda; and who had it left to his choice to go to London, Bruxelles, or even to Constantinople, and, pro-

*“ been conceived and arranged in the retreats sacred to Philosophy,  
“ and to the description we thus allude to. The PROJECT  
“ is the EMANCIPATION of a world.”*

In the next column we find, that mankind are not only indebted to them (the French Government) for Liberty; but  
*“ they owe it to them, that the horrible reign of Priest-craft  
“ and MONARCHIC INSTITUTIONS have not been restored  
“ in one country and established for centuries in every quarter  
“ of the globe. To them we owe the renewed guarantees of  
“ ultimate victory in the struggle TO PULL DOWN AND DE-  
“ STROY THRONES. To them ENGLISHMEN CAN ONLY  
“ LOOK WITH CONFIDENCE for a redress of those grievances  
“ which have been GENERATED IN THE LAP OF MO-  
“ NARCHY, and nourished and fostered from the cradle, to  
“ a state of manhood by wicked Ministers, and the sycophant  
“ eulogists OF A WORTHLESS COURT. From them, Europe  
“ is yet destined to receive the PALM OF LIBERTY, &c. &c.  
“ Glorious events! and glorious times, in which men live  
“ only to witness the downfall of some pretender at (probably mis-  
“ printed for as) the prelude to THE OVERTHROW OF SOME  
“ THRONE.”*—Such are the doctrines forced upon that part of the public who support this Paper. They need no comment, but are such as should rouse the attention of every Englishman to oppose them. T.

vided



vided he would but propagate the principles of the French Revolution, was certain of repairing from the fund of the brotherhood the loss that his fortune had sustained.

It is thus that many new degrees had been added to Masonry, and even a new society, which the restless enthusiasm of the Sophisters of Impiety had invented to spread the ancient systems of disorganizing Liberty and Equality, and to ensure their triumph. It was to the Propaganda that they were indebted for the immense number of their adepts; or rather, in rendering impiety so common, the spirit of Philosophism had gained so much ground, that it was scarcely necessary to be initiated into the Occult mysteries to be a complete conspirator.

At that time few novices were to be found either in the Grand Lodges of the *Orient* or of the *Contrat Social*. The Revolution was so openly carried on there, that the Court could not be ignorant of it. Among the number, it was impossible that some should not look upon the Revolution as a most dreadful scourge, and in reality several were of this opinion. With certainty I may number among these latter the French Nobleman who received the letter mentioned before, from Alphonse Le Roi.

Being

The  
Court  
and  
Lewis  
XVI. in-  
formed of  
the Con-  
spiracy,  
but to no  
purpose.

Being questioned, whether he had not observed something among the *Masons* tending towards the French Revolution, he made the following reply :

" I have been the orator in many Lodges, and had got to a pretty high degree. As yet, however, I had observed nothing which in my opinion could threaten the state. I had not attended for a long time, when in 1786 I was met in Paris by one of the brethren, who reproached me for having abandoned the association ; he pressed me to return, and particularly to attend a meeting which he told me would be very interesting. I agreed to attend on the day mentioned, and was extremely well received. I heard things which I cannot tell you ; but they were of such a nature, that, full of indignation, I went immediately to the Minister. I said to him, *Sir, I am not entitled to question you ; I am aware of the importance and of the consequences which may result from my intrusion ; but were I to be sent to the Bastille, I must ask you (because I believe the safety of the King and of the State is at stake), whether the Freemasons are watched, and whether you are acquainted with what is contriving in their Lodges ?*

" The Minister turned upon his heel, and answered, *Make yourself easy, Sir, you shall not go to the Bastille, nor will the Freemasons trouble the State.*"

This

This Minister was not a man who could be suspected of having in any degree tampered in the Revolution; but he most certainly thought it chimerical even to surmise a plan of overthrowing monarchy, and concluded, like the *Comte de Vergennes*, that, while he had the control of an army of two hundred thousand men, a revolution was little to be feared.

Lewis XVI. was himself warned of the dangers which threatened his throne, but continued in that security which only ceased to delude him on his return from Varennes, when he said to a person in whom he confided, *Why did I not believe, eleven years since, what I so clearly see to-day! for I had been warned of it so long ago as that.*

If any one was entitled to disbelieve plots formed against his person or his throne, it was certainly the unfortunate Lewis XVI. Seeking only the happiness of his subjects in all the sincerity of his heart, never having committed a single act of injustice, perpetually sacrificing his own interest to that of his people, and ambitious of nothing so much as of the love of that same people, how was it possible for him to conceive that the conspirators could succeed in representing him as a tyrant? Lewis XVI. had not one of those vices which draw down hatred on the Monarch's head. Publicly proclaimed the justest of Princes, and the most honest man of his empire, he was unfortunately the weakest of Kings—

But

But if ever Ministers prepared a Revolution, it was certainly those in whom he placed his confidence. He began by entrusting himself to *Mr. De Maurepas*, whose inactive and careless disposition, dreading nothing so much as violent shocks or tempestuous broils, quietly permitted all those to gather which were only to burst forth when he was gone. The Sophister *Turgot* appeared but for a moment, as it were to make an essay of those systems which silently sapped the throne. The fordid œconomy of *Mr. de St. Germain* only served to deprive the Monarch of his bravest supporters. The quack *Necker* showed no talent but that of ruining the public treasury with his loans, and of accusing *Mr. de Calonne's* profusion of the fact. Under *Mr. de Vergennes*, false policy fomented external Revolutions, but to infuse the spirit for, and prepare interior ones. Greedy courtiers disgust the Monarch with their intrigues, alienate the people by their scandals, corrupt them by their impiety, and irritate them by their luxury. The assembly of the *Notables* convene with the apparent intention only of repairing great errors, at the sole expence of the Nobility and Clergy; and nothing guaranteed that great sacrifices would not prove a great source for new dilapidations. New dissensions threatened to break out between the King and the High Courts of Judicature, when *Brienne* was on the eve of making his appearance  
to

to complete the ruin by turning on the Monarch all that contempt and hatred which should justly have been heaped upon himself. Not a single minister attempted to brook the torrent of Rebellion and Impiety; not one reflected on the inefficacy of the laws for a people who hated their chiefs, and had lost all tie of religion. The Sophisters of Holbach's club, those of Masonry, and all the male-contents of all classes, whether noble or plebeian, had but little to do to create the desire of a Revolution; and that was the period which our conspirators waited for to consummate their plots; that was what the Propagandists called *creating want*. Every thing denoted that the time was come, and they applied themselves to muster up their forces for the completion of the catastrophe.

In the year 1787, about the same time that Mr. de Calonne, anxious to retrieve the finances from the disorder into which Necker had thrown them, was convening the *Notables*, a secret association, supposed of new invention, established itself at the *Hotel de Lussan* in the street *Croix des Petits Champs*, under the name of *Amis des Noirs* (Friends of the Blacks). There was nothing new in this association but the name. All sectaries of Liberty, whether ancient or modern, every class of Sophisters, and all the Revolutionary Masons, had adopted this appellation only the better to conceal the grand object of their Conspiracy under the

Friends  
of the  
Blacks.

the specious pretext of humanity. While occupying all Europe with the question they had proposed, on the slavery of the Negroes in America, they never lost sight of that Revolution which they had so long meditated, and which was to liberate all Europe from the pretended slavery of the laws and of supposed tyrants. Their Lodges might become suspicious by their daily meetings, and they wished not to lose sight for a single hour of the grand object of their plots. The adepts did not agree as to the *method* of the Revolution, or as to the laws to be substituted to those of the Monarchy. All however were unanimous on *Equality and Liberty*, the grand secret of their mysteries. They also agreed, that both Liberty and Equality were at an end, wherever the people were not sovereign, and did not make their own laws, wherever they could not revoke and change them at pleasure, and particularly where the people were subjected to a Monarch or Magistrates who governed in their own right, or who were not the agents and the executors of their will, and subject to be recalled whenever it might please the people. But among the adepts were many Sophisters who shaped out *Liberty and Equality* according to their own interests, their dispositions, their rank and their fortunes. They were in some sort the Aristocratic Jacobins. The adept Counts, Marquisses, Dukes, Knights, and wealthy Citizens,

zens, all these were perfectly of opinion, that they were to lose nothing of their rank or fortune in this new system of Equality, but that, on the contrary, they were to share among them all the rights, authority, and influence which they were to wrest from their unfortunate Monarch. In a word, they wished for such a King as the first Jacobin Legislators dreamt of, a King whom they could domineer over, and who had no authority over them. Others wished for an Equality of Liberty in the *grande*s or wealthy, counterpoised by an Equality of Liberty in the plebeians, and concentrating in a common chief the King. This was the Equality of the *Monarchists*, who thought themselves guiltless rebels because they were not sufficiently powerful to direct the course of the rebellion. As for the last class, they wished neither for a constitutional nor any other King. With them every King was a Tyrant, and every tyrant was to be overthrown; all Aristocracy was to be exploded; all titles, rank, or power was to be levelled; and this last class alone was initiated in the profound secrets of the Revolution. They conceived that they could only proceed by degrees; that it was necessary to unite in order to compass the overthrow of the existing order of things; and, that accomplished, to wait the favourable moment for accomplishing their ultimate designs.

It

It was in this view that Brissot, Condorcet, and Syeyes proposed to form a general union of all the adepts, whatever might be their Revolutionary Systems, under the title of *Friends of the Blacks*, it was even agreed, that every man who had any serious cause of complaint against the court should be invited to join them. This was the reason why they invited the *Marquis de Beauport de St. Aulaire*, whom they supposed to be imbued with their principles through desire of revenge. But they were grossly mistaken. The Marquis had great reason to complain of the Ministry; but no one could better distinguish the cause of the Monarch from the injustice of his Ministers.

This however proved a fortunate error for history. What I am about to present to the reader concerning this association is made public by permission of Mr. de Beauport. He was kind (and I will say patriotic) enough to favor me with an account of what he had been eye-witness to in that secret society; and in vain would the historian seek a better authority.

Consonant to the wishes of its projectors, the association of the *Friends of the Blacks* was composed of all the adepts who had imbibed the principles of modern Philosophism, and they were generally initiated in the mysteries of Freemasonry. In the multitude of brethren were many thousands of dupes, all ardent for, all ready to second the

Revo-



Revolution, and all promoting it with their utmost exertions. Each member subscribed two guineas, and was entitled to attend the deliberations. That the plans might be better digested, a *regulating committee* was formed of the following persons, viz. Condorcet, Mirabeau the elder, Syeyes, Brissot, Carra, the Duc de la Rochefoucault, Clavieres, Pelletier de St. Fargeau, Valadi, La Fayette, and some others.

Had I not even mentioned the French Revolution, this list of its prime movers must naturally make it occur. And what could be the object of such a society, which begins by giving itself a *regulating committee* composed precisely of all those men who, in the course of the revolution, have shewn themselves its greatest abettors? A Condorcet, who would have smiled at the conflagration of the universe, provided neither Priest nor King could spring from its ashes\*! A Mirabeau, who to the impiety, the ambition, and all the other crimes of a Catiline, had nothing of his own to add but cowardice, and still retained all the daring profligacy of his patron†.

Conspirators under the name of *Friends of the Blacks.*

When the historian shall depict a Syeyes, let him begin with the visage of a snake; for it is

\* He murdered himself. T.

† Died in great agonies of pain, 3d April 1791, supposed to have been poisoned by the Jacobins. T.

solely to the art of hiding his venom that that abominable character is indebted for his reputation of a profound genius. Like Mirabeau, he had long studied the Revolutionary arts; he left to the latter the more striking features of crime, reserving to himself those luxuries of obscure criminals, who point out to the ruffians the crimes to be committed, and then sculk behind their blood-thirsty cohorts \*.

With all the desire of operating a Philosophical Revolution, and of conducting it with profound policy, Brissot only dared appear on the second rank: But he had already formed the plan of his Republic, and his Philosophism only shrunk from the horrors of the Revolution, when the axe, with which he had himself assailed the throne, was suspended over his own head †.

Claviere, a greedy and frigid stock-jobber, comes from Necker's own country to sell to the Parisians the Revolutionary arts which he had practised there. Moderate in his expressions, even when he insinuated the most treacherous and ferocious means, he seemed to have secretly watched Syeyes to learn the art of forming disciples ‡.

\* Still exists, 20th September, 1797. T.

† Was guillotined 31st of October 1793. T.

‡ Murdered himself the 1st of December 1793. T.

After

After having kissed the gallows, Carra appears to revenge himself on those laws which had not punished him for his thefts, and he seems to enjoy the liberty to which he is restored only to blaspheme like a demoniac both God and King\*.

He that is ignorant of the effect of flattery on a weak mind, will be surprised to see the name of Rochefoucault among beings of this species. Condorcet wanted a tool; as long as he could direct this unfortunate Duke he led him every where, to the Lodges, to the Clubs, to the National Assembly; he even persuaded him that he was leading him through the paths of virtue and honour†.

As to La Fayette, on his white horse at the head of the Revolutionary bands, he thought himself the favorite child of Mars; seated near the Sophisters, he believed himself a Philosopher; and, the Hero of the Fish-market, he affects to rival Washington. Happy for him if his misfortunes have inspired him with a due sense of shame and sorrow for having been so long a time the puppet of the Sophisters and incendiary firebrands.

\* Guillotined the 31st of October 1793. T.

† When he could lead him no longer he sent assassins to murder the Duke, who was torn to pieces by the mob, September 2, 1792. T.

G g 2

Lastly,

Lastly, the Advocate Bergasse was called to this regulating committee. This man had neither the folly of La Fayette nor the wickedness of Condorcet, but he believed in Revolutionary Liberty and Equality as he did in the *Somnambules*, who had persuaded him that he was their Messiah. He even expected to act the part. When, in the first days of that Assembly which was called National, he was entrusted with the care of framing the code of Liberty and Equality, he was quite surprized to find himself coupled with Mounier and several other co-deputies. He meant alone to restore the people to Liberty and Equality, and to triumph over Despotism. It was not the superiority of talents nor his high repute for honesty that acquired him his seat in this committee, but the wild enthusiasm of his ideas and his thirst after a new order of things. Happily for him, what made him quit the new Legislators, made him also abandon the Conspirators. His secession only left Condorcet, Syeyes, Mirabeau, and the other rebels, more at liberty to act.

When the Marquis de Beaupoil was invited to inscribe his name on the list of this association, he candidly believed that its object was the consideration of those questions, so worthy a generous soul, on the means to be proposed to the King of alleviating or perhaps abolishing the slavery of the Negroes. He did not however remain long in his

his error. The establishment of Liberty and Equality, and the compiling of the Rights of Man, were the leading features of all their deliberations, and consequences of the most alarming nature to Sovereigns were drawn and debated without the least hesitation.

“ Notwithstanding my professed aversion for  
 “ such opinions,” says the Marquis, “ I had the  
 “ constancy to attend the meetings of the regu-  
 “ lating committee till I was perfectly master of  
 “ their plans. I remarked that all the members  
 “ of the association were also members of the Ma-  
 “ sonic Lodges, and particularly of that society  
 “ actuated by the same principles called *Philan-*  
 “ *tropes*. I also observed that there already exist-  
 “ ed a close correspondence with the other asso-  
 “ ciations of the same sort both in Europe and  
 “ America, and the general talk was on the cer-  
 “ tainty of a Revolution which was nigh at hand.  
 “ Those brethren who did not belong to the com-  
 “ mittee came to bring their money, and repeat  
 “ their most ardent wishes for the success of its  
 “ arduous undertakings. They then mixed in the  
 “ different Lodges and Clubs, which in fact pro-  
 “ fessed the same principles, and the regulating  
 “ committee primed over these various Clubs,  
 “ only because it was composed of the most wicked  
 “ members from each.

Object of  
their  
commit-  
tee.

G g 3

“ Their

“ Their grand object known, I might have  
 “ pryed into their most secret mysteries; but I  
 “ disdained dissimulation; and had I remained  
 “ longer in this haunt of Conspirators I must have  
 “ adopted it. Full of indignation, I declaimed  
 “ vehemently against their plots; I required that  
 “ my name should be erased from the list; I  
 “ blotted it out myself, and left their den for  
 “ ever.

“ I ought certainly to have hastened to inform  
 “ Government of the doctrines and plans of this  
 “ Association\*; but to denounce a society which  
 “ had admitted me to its mysteries, bears a face  
 “ of perfidy which I should have rejected had it  
 “ occurred. I confined myself therefore to print-  
 “ ing a sort of antidote under the title of *Unity of*  
 “ *the Monarchical power*. Some time after that,  
 “ I printed a work called *Of the Republic and of the*  
 “ *Monarchy*, with a view to warn the King, and  
 “ the nation at large, of the consequences pending  
 “ on the Revolution. This was more than ne-  
 “ cessary to expose me to all the vengeance of  
 “ the Conspirators. I was acquainted that the  
 “ very day after my erasure, the whole fitting was  
 “ spent in suggesting means of punishing what  
 “ they called my treachery; many violent opi-

\* This is a most awful example of the fatal consequences  
 of oaths of secrecy. T.

“ nions

“ nions were broached ; but Mirabeau only voted  
 “ for calumny and other means of representing me  
 “ as a dangerous man, and one to whom no credit  
 “ was due.. Carra and Gorsas were entrusted with  
 “ the commission, and it was from their pens that  
 “ flowed the most violent declamations against  
 “ me ; and when the proscriptions began my  
 “ name was to be found foremost upon the list.”

If the candour and loyalty of the Marquis hindered him from staying any longer among these Conspirators, his account at least demonstrates that he had remained long enough to remove all doubt as to the grand object of their mysteries. I really believe myself entitled to announce to the public, that a day will come when even all the most secret deliberations of this den of Conspirators will be made public.

When the Revolution rendered it unnecessary for the prime agents to wear the mask any longer, the name of *Friends of the Blacks* was thrown aside and the association appeared to be dissolved. *The regulating committee* remained, and only enveloped itself in greater darkness the more surely to direct all the Parisian Clubs, the Sections, the Revolutionary Societies, and even the Jacobins themselves. If Gobet \*, the too famous intruded Archbishop of Paris,

\* I may now declare it, since this unhappy Gobet has fallen a victim to his vain terrors and mean apostasy. It was he

G g 4

whom

Paris, was not a member of this committee he knew their plans; he must even have been present at their meetings more than once. He would not otherwise have spoken so emphatically of what was contriving there at the time this unhappy apostate requested some secret conferences with me, concerning his reconciliation with the church. I am at present perfectly persuaded, that it was the fear of the regulating committee which hindered him from keeping his word, and in some sort atoning for the horrible scandal he had given. It is true, that he never spoke to me of the committee but in general terms, yet it was always with so much terror that I could easily surmise the atrocity of their plans: "No," said he, "no, you cannot conceive you could not give credit to the lengths

whom I would not name when speaking (in my *History of the French Clergy during the Revolution*) of the Constitutional Bishops that wished to retract. Gobet was at their head. He requested several conferences with me, and we had three, which lasted two hours each. Every thing was prepared. Rome had answered with all the tenderness imaginable to Gobet's promises. His retraction was comprised in six letters, which were already written and directed to the Pope, the King, the Archbishops, the Clergy, the Department, and the Municipality of Paris. But the unfortunate man wished first to quit France, to be out of the reach of the Jacobins. The report of his departure was whispered about, he was frightened, he remained, and Robespierre ordered him to be guillotined on the 9th of April 1794.

" they



“ they mean to go, what plans, what means they  
“ have in agitation. You have seen nothing as  
“ yet.” We were, nevertheless, in April of the  
third year of the Revolution, and I had witnessed  
many horrid scenes.

Long before this period I was acquainted with  
an adept, a great Mason and Deist, but an enemy  
to carnage and plunder. He wished for a *Philoso-  
phical Revolution* conducted with more order and  
less violence, and was a member of the regulating  
committee. I shall never forget what he told me  
one day, when speaking of the committee in near-  
ly the same terms as Gobet had done. I could  
have foretold all that has since been done against  
the Nobility, the Clergy, and the King. “ I go  
“ there,” said he, “ but with horror, and to op-  
“ pose their frightful projects. Hereafter shall be  
“ known all that is carried on there, and how  
“ those savage minds add to the horrors of the  
“ Revolution. It shall be known, but after my  
“ death. I am too wise to publish it during my  
“ life. I know too well what they are ”

I will not attempt to supply from my imagina-  
tion what might be surmised from such a speech,  
respecting a committee entirely composed of the  
most inveterate enemies of the altar and of the  
throne which Masonry or the Sophisters could  
produce. But I will lay before my readers what  
I have learned from various adepts concerning that  
part

part of the Conspiracy to which this volume has naturally led us.

Correspondences of the committee.

Of all the means adopted by the regulating committee, that which contributed the most to form the immense multitude of armed men which they wanted, was their correspondence with the Masonic Lodges dispersed at that time all over France in great numbers. In Paris alone there were one hundred and fifty, and as many in proportion, if not more, in the other towns and even in the villages.

Deliberations taken at the *regulating committee* were transmitted to the *central committee of the Grand Orient*; thence they were sent to the *Venerables* or *Masters* of the different Lodges in the provinces. The very year in which this regulating committee was established a great many of the *Venerables* received instructions accompanied by the following letter: "As soon as you shall receive the enclosed packet you will acknowledge the receipt of it. You will subjoin the oath of punctually and faithfully executing all orders which you shall receive in the same form, without making any inquiry whence they come or by whom they shall be sent. If you refuse this oath, or if you are not true to it, you will be looked upon as having violated the oath \* which

" you

\* This is another example of the fatal consequences of binding oneself by oaths of the tendency of which we are ignorant.

“ you took at your initiation. Remember the  
 “ *Æqua Tophana* (the most subtle of poisons).  
 “ Remember the *poniards* that will start from their  
 “ sheaths to pierce the heart of a traitor.”

Such nearly were the contents of a letter received by a man formerly a most zealous Mason, and of whom I learned that similar orders had been sent to the other Masters of Lodges. For nearly these two years past I have been in possession of a memorial which names several of the *Venerables* who received these instructions and faithfully complied with them. Such was the conduct of La Coste, a Physician of Montignac-le-Comte, in Perigord, originally the founder of the Lodge in that town, a Deputy at the second Assembly, and finally voting the King's death in the third. I can also name the Attorney Gairaux, who did not show less zeal for the Revolution. He was not the Master of the Lodge when these first instructions were sent. The packet was delivered to the Chev.

norant. It may also serve to explain the question before noticed in page 284, as being put at the initiation of the Fellow-craft to the degree of Master: *Brother, are you disposed to execute all the orders of the Grand Master, though you were to receive contrary orders from a King, an Emperor, or any other Sovereign whatever?*—The danger of such oaths will receive a still stronger demonstration in the Third Part of this Work, when we come to treat of the dark and iniquitous Cabals and menacing Conspiracies of the *Illuminés*. T.

de

de la Calprade, at that time intrusted with the hammer at the Lodge at Sarlat; but, surmising to what lengths these first letters might lead him, he very providently resigned his place to Gairaux\*.

I am thus minute in my accounts, because it is essential that history be informed how so deep a plot was carried on, and how those millions of armed men appeared to second it at the same instant in every part of France.

Farther  
extension  
of Free-  
masonry.

Left their numbers should not be sufficiently great, *the regulating Committee* resolved on admitting a class of men, which had long since been excluded, to the lesser mysteries of Masonry. It was that of the day labourers, and all the lower classes of mechanics, even vagabonds and ruffians. —With these men *Liberty and Equality* needed no farther explanation. It was easy for the adepts to infuse the revolutionary enthusiasm into them by the power of these words alone.

\* I was in possession of another memorial which I am sorry to say has been mislaid. It was the account of a gentleman, who, having refused to continue the correspondence with the Masonic Central Committee, was punished for it by him to whom he delivered it over. At the first dawn of the Revolution he was thrown into prison as an Aristocrate. Orders were sent for his delivery. The master, now become a Municipal Officer, changed the order for that of letting him walk upon a very high terrace. At the same time orders were given to the sentry to throw him off it, and these latter orders were executed. He did not die however of the fall, and I believe he is at present living in Spain.

The

The Mafons of a higher rank in Paris did not like to fraternize with such brethren. It was necessary to call some from the Provinces, and in a short time the suburbs of *St. Antoine* and *St. Marceau* were entirely Mafonized.

Many years before the formation of this Regulating Committee, the well-informed adepts would write that the number of Freemasons was *incomparably* greater in France than in England; that the hair-dressers and valets, and every sort of profession flocked to the Lodges \*. It will not be an exaggeration therefore to calculate the number of Freemasons at six hundred thousand; and at that period it could not be supposed that the generality of this immense number were averse to the plans of the Occult Lodges. Impiety and the declamations of the Sophisters supplied the last mysteries. The greatest novices were enthusiastically wedded to the ideas of Liberty and Equality. Let a hundred thousand of the brethren be subtracted as untainted with these principles, it will be the most the historian can do in favour of our youth who remained faithful to the spirit of their forefathers. Thus the *Regulating Club* could rely upon the support of five hundred thousand brethren, at that time spread all over France, all zealous for the

Strength  
and num-  
bers of  
the Free-  
masons.

\* *Ueber die Alten and Newen Mysterien* bey *Frederich Maurer*, 1782.

Revolution,

Revolution, all ready to rise at the first signal and to impart the shock to all other classes of the people. The Sophisters already boasted that it was not such an easy thing to triumph over three millions of men.

This was the plan adopted by the Committee to organize the Revolutionary bands. The Sophisters had cleared the way by perverting the public opinion. The hiding places and dens of a sect, the sworn enemies to Christianity and Sovereigns, had opened and expanded themselves. The adepts of Occult Masonry had multiplied; their ancient tenets of Impiety and Rebellion had identified them in the new Lodges with that of modern Philosophism. Opinion had gained the heart; but plots, cunning, and secret artifice, had mustered up the forces. Had *Necker*, *Briennes*, the *Deficit* or the *Notables* never been mentioned in France; had Lewis XIV. been upon the throne when the *Regulating Committee* and the *Central Club* of Masonry should have completed the organization of their skulking adherents, Lewis XIV. himself would not have stopped the Revolution. It would have found chiefs. Public opinion would have named them, and the banners of truth would have been deserted. At the sound of *Liberty and Equality* he would have seen his legions disband, and rally under the standard of revolt. Had Lewis XVI. refused to convoke the States General, the  
Regu-

Regulating Committee would have convened them; five hundred thousand adepts under arms would have supported the convocation, and the people would have flocked to the elections.

Such was the progress of this twofold Conspiracy at the time of the convocation of the States General. The skulking Sophisters of Masonry and the barefaced Sophisters of Holbach's Club perceived that it would be necessary to choose a chief who might be made the stalking-horse, and give them a sanction by his name. He was to be powerful, that he might forward the crimes which they had planned; he was to be cruel, lest he should flinch at the sight of the numerous victims that were to be sacrificed to their horrid plots.—He needed not the talents, but the vices of a Cromwell. The conspirators soon cast their eyes on *Philip D'Orleans*, the pupil of some evil Genius.

Philip  
d'Orleans  
elected  
Chief of  
the Con-  
spirators.

D'Orleans, for his part, was conspiring as well as the combined Sophisters. More wicked than ambitious, he aspired at the Throne; but, like the evil genius, he delighted in ruin and devastation, even though he should not thereby exalt himself: *Philip* had sworn to seat himself on the Throne, or to overturn it though he were to be crushed under the ruins. For a long time had this unparalleled monster been callous to honor or remorse; a brazen front repelled the shafts of contempt or of disdain, nor was he to be affected by  
the

the hatred of man or of heaven. A youth spent in debauchery had deadened every honorable sentiment of his heart, and by the blackest deeds he sought to ensure his expectations of fortune. At an age when the love of riches is scarcely known, public report accused him of having enticed the young Prince of Lamballe into debauchery merely to secure to himself the immense fortune of this young Prince, who fell a victim to his cunning, while in quest of pleasure. Nor is there an action of his life which could render at all improbable such atrocious perfidy. Time only more and more developed a heart capable of such designs; he was cowardly and revengeful; ambitious and cringing; prodigal and avaricious. Proud of his name and the rank of Prince, he was the humble servant of the vilest populace; choleric and impetuous before his friends, cool and dissembling before those whom he wished to ruin, callous to all good actions if he saw no direct means of diverting them to evil purposes, and never meditating such dark and hideous plots as when he assumed the character of sensibility and benevolence. Little capable (from cowardice) of daring crimes, he was wicked enough to dedicate his riches to the completion of them. His heart, in a word, was the common sewer of every baleful passion, and of every vice. He needed but the opportunity to discover  
his



his bias to evil; and such was the chief with which Lucifer presented the Conspirators.

During the contentions which subsisted between the Court and the Parliaments *Philip* had leagued with several of those Magistrates who were more worthy of being seated in the Regulating Club of the Conspirators than in the first Tribunal of the kingdom. He was much more employed as their tool to insult the Royal Majesty in the very sanctuary of the laws, than as a leader against the encroachments of Briennes\*.

Lewis XVI. for the first time showed his resentment, and Philip was exiled to Villers-Coterets. This was the spark that fired D'Orleans's heart with vengeance. He already hated Lewis XVI. because he was King; he hated Marie Antionette because she was Queen; he swore their ruin; he swore it in the transports of rage and fury; nor did his agitation cease but to leave him at liberty to meditate the means of vengeance. His first step was to call to his councils the greatest villains France could produce. That Laclos whose sable genius seemed to rise from the Stygian Lakes to guide the venomous and tortuous course of the blackest crimes.

Mirabeau and Syeyes flocked thither, nor was it difficult for them to point out the great helps to

\* History of the Conspiracy of the Duke of Orleans.

be acquired from the Masonic Lodges, of which he had been chosen the honorary chief. The Legions of Hell are bound by the bonds of friendship when evil is their object, and the grand plan was combined during the short period that Philip remained in exile. At that time he was initiated in the Occult Mysteries, but not as men of his rank formerly were; for it is certain that the brethren had considered him as sufficiently wicked to be admitted to their deepest mysteries. It is certain that the King-killing trial of the Vault in the degree of *Kadosch* was a voluptuous one for him.— In pronouncing these words, *Hatred to all Worship, Hatred to all Kings*, he must have seen all his hopes vanish of seating himself on the throne of the unfortunate Lewis XVI. but he breathed vengeance; and, though he were to expend his life and fortune in the pursuit, he would not relent. He renounces the throne under the penalty of perjury, and was overjoyed at having associated with men who had sworn to destroy all thrones, provided they would first strike that of his own relative and King.

This oath discovered to him an ocean of crimes, but he did not shrink at their sight; they only served to stimulate him to the perpetration of them. Brissot declared that he subscribed to them all at that period, but that *the Court was too strong as yet*, and that he only retired to England to gain time,

time, and to let the Revolution ripen. The Marquis de Beaupoil attests this fact, in his memorial, as having heard Brissot himself declare it.

The time was not yet come upon which the Regulating Committees had decided. They waited for the States General; their artifices, their clubs, and a cloud of writers had nearly made the demand general. The Parliament of Paris called for them. France looked up to them as the regenerating power; but I have not as yet enumerated all the plots nor all the sects which clamorously called for them to entomb the Monarchy and all its laws.

In these divers plots the Sophisters of the Encyclopædia, opposing the rights of Liberty and Equality to the Altar, had thrown themselves headlong into the gulph of hatred to Royalty.--- The Tenebrous and Occult Lodges of Masonry, the antique mysteries of the adopted slave, had received the disciples of Voltaire and Diderot into their bosom, but to connect and more secretly invigorate that hatred of Christ and of Kings. The Sophisters of Impiety and of Rebellion had only intermixed their plots with those of the Lodges, or rather dens, ready to cast forth their Legions of adepts and firebrands enthusiastically armed to establish their Liberty and Equality on the ruins of the Altar and the Throne. The frightful Propaganda appeared with its treasures

H h 2

and

and its apostles.—The *Central* and the *Regulating Committees* could boast of their *Secret Correspondences*, their council, and their chief—all the forces of Rebellion and of Impiety were organized—still those were not the only scourges that were to desolate France.

Under the name of ILLUMINÉS a band of Conspirators had coalesced with the Encyclopedists and Masons, far more dangerous in their tenets, more artful in their plots, and more extensive in their plans of devastation. They more silently prepared the explosions of the Revolutionary volcano, not merely swearing hatred to the Altar of Christ and the Throne of Kings, but swearing at once hatred to every God, to every Law, to every Government, to all society and social compact; and in order to destroy every plea and every foundation of the social contract, they proscribed the terms *MINE and THINE*, acknowledging neither Equality nor Liberty but in the *entire, absolute and universal overthrow of all PROPERTY whatever*.

That such a sect could have existed; that it could have acquired power; that it does exist; and that it is to this sect that the most terrible scourges of the Revolution are to be traced, are without doubt among those extraordinary phenomena, of the reality of which the most incontrovertible proofs alone can convince the reader.

Such

Such will be the object of the third Part of these Memoirs.

After having successively developed the Conspiracy of the *Sophisters of Impiety*, that of the *Sophisters of Rebellion*, and that of the *Sophisters of Anarchy*, it will be easy for us to apply the different disastrous consequences of each of these conspiring sects to the French Revolution, and to prove that the Monster called JACOBIN is no other than the aggregate of the triple conspiracy and of the triple sect.

END OF THE SECOND PART.











543 MAR 15